

## Appendix M

# PUBLIC OUTREACH

May, 2001



2001 RTP Technical Appendix

## Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Public Participation and Outreach Program.....	M-1
Public Agency Comments.....	M-11
Comments by Individuals and Non-Profit Groups.....	M-164
Public Outreach Workshop Comments.....	M-226

# **2001 REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND OUTREACH PROGRAM**

## **Final Report**

### **May, 2001**

#### **Introduction**

At the beginning of the 2001 RTP process, SCAG embarked on an extensive public outreach process to ensure input and community feedback as the update progressed. This effort complemented the bottom-up planning process and relied heavily on the 14 subregions within the SCAG region. The subregions are ideally suited for public outreach as they maintain direct lines of communication with community groups, businesses, transit operators, environmental organizations, and the public within their cities and local communities. In 10 of the subregions, the subregional organization directly conducted the outreach process with SCAG support. In the other four subregions, SCAG provided consultant-led outreach efforts to ensure that no subregion was left out of the process. As evidence of extensive public outreach, SCAG received more than 1,500 comments on the Draft 2001 RTP and those comments were taken into consideration in the finalization of the 2001 RTP. A summary of the comments and SCAG responses can be found in the Technical Appendix to the RTP.

#### **Framework**

As a metropolitan planning organization (MPO), SCAG is required to implement a public involvement process to provide complete information, timely public notice and full-public access to key decisions and to support early and continuing public involvement in developing its regional plans. This is in accordance with Section 450.316(b) of the metropolitan planning regulations. SCAG formally adopted a Public Participation Program in September 1993. Further, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and associated regulations and policies, including President Clinton's 1994 Executive Order 1298 on Environmental Justice, seek to assure minority and low-income populations are involved in the regional planning process.

#### **Public Participation and Outreach Program**

SCAG's multi-pronged Public Participation and Outreach Program including the following:

- # Subregional outreach programs
- # Presentations to established organizations on the RTP throughout the region
- # Specific public workshops on the RTP throughout the region
- # Electronic Town Halls to focus upon specific topics of the RTP
- # Direct outreach to the minority and low-income populations
- # A Transportation Summit focusing on the regional transportation situation
- # Business roundtable forums with representatives of the business community
- # Development of written and visual material to communicate the status and content of the RTP, including newsletters, fact sheets and PowerPoint presentations

- # A public comment form used throughout the outreach program (in person at public meetings and online)
- # Creation and further development of community contact databases throughout the region
- # Direct mail and electronic mail to community contacts regarding the RTP
- # SCAG's website featuring the Draft 2001 RTP, including public meeting notices and the latest written information on the RTP (bilingual in English and Spanish)
- # Advertising of Environmental Justice community dialogues in ethnic media
- # Advertising support for the RTP Draft and Final Program Environmental Impact Report throughout the region

## **Public Outreach Implementation**

Following the adoption of the 1998 RTP, SCAG initiated a series of outreach activities to communicate the RTP update process. These included speeches and public presentations by SCAG staff and elected officials to a variety of regional and local audiences. In the summer of 1999, SCAG initiated contracts with the subregional organizations to perform RTP outreach activities. In November 1999, SCAG hired Arellano Associates as its public outreach consultant. Arellano Associates then began working with the subregions to ensure that they commenced their own respective outreach activity.

Also, following the adoption of the 1998 RTP, SCAG established 11 Task Forces charged with reviewing various elements of the RTP. The Task Forces included public representation from across the region, including elected officials, local cities' technical staff, public organizations and the private sector.

As the outreach activities increased in early 2000, the preliminary work from the Task Forces was documented and, in turn, communicated to the public. This was accomplished through a series of organizational presentations, community dialogues, an electronic town hall, the website and written material. It was also during this time that the final alternatives and/or policy recommendations from each task force were finalized. As final decisions were made, all outreach materials and presentations were updated to reflect the latest RTP positions.

In November, 2000, the Draft RTP was released. Another wave of public outreach activities was held to communicate the proposed update to the 1998 RTP. Additional public workshops, Environmental Justice community dialogues and an electronic town hall were held. In addition, the Draft RTP and all outreach documents were uploaded to the RTP website and communicated to the public by direct mail and electronic mail.

### ***Environmental Justice***

As referenced above, federal planning regulations and policies require that a wide spectrum of stakeholders have the opportunity to participate meaningfully in the planning process. Toward this end, SCAG placed an emphasis on reaching out to the minority and low-income communities and the leadership that represents these communities.

A series of Community Dialogue **meetings** (41) were held throughout the region. For these dialogues, an overview of SCAG and its purpose was presented prior to delving into the content and importance of the RTP. Appropriate language interpretation services were provided for these meetings as needed.

Further, a series of four (4) of meetings were held with a set of leadership groups, which represent the minority and low-income communities, including those focusing upon environmental issues. SCAG elected officials lead these meetings. With this audience, SCAG reviewed its environmental justice policy language as it was being developed. It also reviewed its RTP environmental justice impact analysis at a set of meetings with these groups. All input was documented and considered in the development of the 2001 RTP.

## **Communication and Media Relations**

Under the direction of the Communications Task Force of the Regional Council, SCAG has implemented a communication strategy to raise the awareness and understanding of the general public about SCAG's mission, programs, plans and policies. This strategy includes various components, including media relations with electronic and print media sources, communication tools including a quarterly newsletter, an annual report, a CD ROM with all SCAG documents, the SCAG Website, and on-going presentations to cities, counties, community groups, business groups and other public interest groups.

SCAG's communication strategy was integrated with the RTP Outreach Program by emphasizing the RTP update process, schedule of activities and other related events. Examples include:

- ſ SCAG newsletter included information regarding the RTP update process and schedule as well as specific features regarding various components of the RTP;
- ſ Press releases and advisories in support of RTP outreach events, meetings and milestones;
- ſ Press conferences and editorial boards with both the general media and ethnic media;
- ſ RTP presentations on public affairs talk shows on radio and television;
- ſ RTP events were placed in local newspaper community calendars throughout the region;

As a result of SCAG's media relations activities, there were hundreds of news articles regarding the RTP in electronic and print media outlets throughout the region, including ethnic media.

## **Public Outreach Results**

With the participation of most SCAG subregions and SCAG's outreach consultant, SCAG was able to complete a comprehensive outreach program. In summary, this included the following:

- # 78 Public Workshops and/or Organizational Presentations
- # 41 Environmental Justice Community Dialogues
- # Two (2) Electronic Town Halls focusing on transportation finance and goods movement, respectively
- # Three (3) Business Roundtable Forums
- # One (1) Transportation Summit at the University of Southern California

- # One (1) E-Commerce Summit
- # A multitude of PowerPoint presentations on the RTP tailored specifically to subregions and updated as the RTP progressed.
- # Eight (8) fact sheets on individual topics of the RTP and updated as the RTP progressed.
- # More than 1,500 public comments on the RTP.
- # More than 585,000 “hits” on the public website, including 30,308 unique users.

All public input efforts and results are documented and held by SCAG. Specific public comments on the RTP were recorded and considered by SCAG staff in the development of this 2001 RTP.

## **Subregional Involvement**

SCAG has a total of 14 subregions, which comprise its six-county region. In fiscal year 1999-2000, eight (8) subregions participated in the RTP outreach program, and 10 subregions participated in fiscal year 2000-2001. The level of involvement in the RTP outreach program varied by each participating subregion. Arellano Associates assigned a staff member to work with each subregion on its respective activities. In general, each subregion assigned its own staff member to coordinate its activities. Arellano Associates assumed the lead in coordinating and completing events in the non-participating subregions. In addition, regional events or events which covered more than one subregion were also coordinated and completed by Arellano Associates.

## **Outreach Activities by Subregion**

Each subregion held a unique set of outreach activities. These included the compilation of a community database, an RTP newsletter (or an existing newsletter which included mention of the RTP), RTP workshops, RTP presentations, Environmental Justice community dialogues and a community survey.

The following describes the activities that took place by subregion since 1999. Those activities listed for non-participating subregions were coordinated and completed by Arellano Associates without the participation of the subregion. Also, a set of “regional” events (not specifically associated with one subregion) were also coordinated and completed by Arellano Associates. All event documentation is contained at SCAG. A total of 125 events have been completed.

### ***Arroyo Verdugo Cities***

#### *RTP Presentations*

- |   |                   |   |
|---|-------------------|---|
| 1 | March 15, 2000    | Arroyo Verdugo Cities Transportation Subcommittee   |
| 2 | July 24, 2000     | City of Burbank Department Managers Meeting         |
| 3 | July 29, 2000     | League of Women Voters                              |
| 4 | August 11, 2000   | Glendale Kiwanis Luncheon                           |
| 5 | November 15, 2000 | Arroyo Verdugo Transportation Subcommittee Meeting  |
| 6 | November 20, 2000 | Arroyo Verdugo Steering Committee Meeting           |
| 7 | January 11, 2001  | City of Pasadena Transportation Advisory Commission |

8	January 23, 2001	City of South Pasadena Transportation Advisory Comm.
9	February 5, 2001	Glendale Homeowners Coordinating Council
10	February 8, 2001	Burbank Transportation Advisory Commission
11	March 1, 2001	Glendale Chamber of Commerce
12	April 4, 2001	League of Women Voters

*RTP Workshop*

13	March 29, 2000	City of Glendale (Workshop focusing upon MagLev)
----	----------------	--

*Environmental Justice Community Dialogue*

14	February 1, 2001	Glendale Chamber of Commerce
----	------------------	------------------------------

***Coachella Valley Association of Governments****Newsletters*

February 28, 2000	<i>CVAG In Review</i>
February 26, 2001	<i>CVAG In Review</i>

*RTP Presentations*

1	February 28, 2000	CVAG Board of Directors
2	April 10, 2000	CVAG Transportation Committee
3	June 24, 2000	Desert Alliance for Community Empowerment
4	February 12, 2001	RTP Public Workshop

*Environmental Justice Community Dialogues*

5	April 15, 2000	Desert Communities Empowerment Zone
6	May 9, 2000	Desert Highlands Community Group
7	June 13, 2000	Desert Highlands Community Group
8	June 24, 2000	Desert Alliance for Community Empowerment
9	March 13, 2001	Desert Highlands Community Group

*Electronic Town Hall*

10	July 20, 2000	Inland Empire event (four subregions)
----	---------------	---------------------------------------

***Gateway Cities Council of Governments****Newsletter*

July, 1999	<i>Gateway Connection</i>
------------	---------------------------

*RTP Presentations*

1	June 21, 2000	Gateway Cities Council of Governments
2	March 27, 2001	Gateway Cities Planning Directors

*Environmental Justice Community Dialogues*

3	June 6, 2000	Huntington Park (Old Timers Foundation)
4	June 8, 2000	Long Beach (Long Beach Transit)

5	November 20, 2000	Council District #8 Economic Development Committee
6	March 20, 2001	Oldtimers Foundation
7	March 21, 2001	Santa Fe Springs Senior Citizens Advisory Committee
8	March 27, 2001	Maywood Senior Citizens Group

*Electronic Town Hall*

- 9 November 28, 2000 Combined event with South Bay Council of Governments

***Imperial Valley Association of Governments****Newsletter*

Fall, 1999

*IVAG Express**RTP Presentation*

- |   |               |   |
|---|---------------|---|
| 1 | May 3, 2000   | Private Industry Council/Job Link                 |
| 2 | May 15, 2000  | San Diego State University Imperial Valley Campus |
| 3 | June 14, 2000 | IVAG Management Committee                         |
| 4 | June 28, 2000 | IVAG Regional Council                             |

*Environmental Justice Community Dialogue*

- |   |                  |  |
|---|------------------|--|
| 5 | June 14, 2000    | Imperial Valley Blind Center                       |
| 6 | January 24, 2001 | El Centro Environmental Justice Community Dialogue |
| 7 | March 7, 2001    | Farm Workers Services Coalition of Imperial County |

*Electronic Town Hall*

- 8 July 20, 2000 Inland Empire event (four subregions)

***City of Los Angeles****RTP Presentations*

- 1 December 12, 2000 LA Area Ch. of Comm. Transportation Committee

*Environmental Justice Community Dialogues*

- |    |                   |   |
|----|-------------------|---|
| 2  | April 25, 2000    | Casa Loma Community Housing                   |
| 3  | May 24, 2000      | East Los Angeles Review Advisory Committee    |
| 4  | January 17, 2001  | East Los Angeles Review Advisory Committee    |
| 5  | January 22, 2001  | SCCED Forum (MTA)                             |
| 6  | January 22, 2001  | Vermont/Slauson Econ. Development Corporation |
| 7  | January 30, 2001  | SCCED Forum (Westside)                        |
| 8  | February 3, 2001  | Boyle Heights Neighborhood Association        |
| 9  | February 12, 2001 | Alameda Corridor Jobs Coalition               |
| 10 | February 21, 2001 | Sylmar Community Coordinating Council         |

*Business Roundtable Meeting*

- 11 April 3, 2001 Los Angeles Economic Development Groups

### ***Las Virgenes/Malibu Council of Governments***

#### *RTP Workshops*

- |                    |                            |
|--------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 June 20, 2000    | Calabasas (City Hall)      |
| 2 June 20, 2000    | Malibu (City Hall)         |
| 3 February 7, 2001 | LVMCOG Interagency Meeting |

### ***North Los Angeles County***

#### *RTP Presentation*

- |                     |                                       |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 December 18, 2000 | North County Transportation Coalition |
|---------------------|---------------------------------------|

#### *Environmental Justice Community Dialogues*

- |                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| 2 June 6, 2000  | Advisory Committee on Disability Issues (for AVTA) |
| 3 June 13, 2000 | Grace Resource Center                              |

### ***Orange County Council of Governments***

#### *Newsletters*

- |                |   |
|----------------|---|
| February, 2000 | <i>OCCOG Regional Information Brief</i> |
| May, 2000      | <i>OCCOG Regional Information Brief</i> |

#### *RTP Workshops*

- |                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 April 26, 2000   | RTP Workshop, Irvine                               |
| 2 May 25, 2000     | RTP Workshop, OCCOG Board, Fountain Valley         |
| 3 June 12, 2000    | RTP Workshop, Brea                                 |
| 4 September 21     | Orange County Transportation Coalition             |
| 5 October 3, 2000  | Santa Ana Citywide Task Force on Pedestrian Safety |
| 6 December 5, 2000 | RTP Workshop, Santa Ana                            |
| 7 January 11, 2001 | Orange County Human Relations Commission           |
| 8 January 25, 2001 | OCCOG Board, Costa Mesa                            |
| 9 March 21, 2001   | RTP Workshop, Brea                                 |

#### *Business Roundtable Meeting*

- |                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| 10 April 2, 2001 | Orange Co. Business Council, Chambers of Commerce |
|------------------|---|

#### *Environmental Justice Community Dialogues*

- |                |  |
|----------------|--|
| May, 2000      | “Virtual Meeting” held via e-mail survey |
| February, 2001 | “Virtual Meeting” held via e-mail survey |

### ***San Bernardino Associated Governments***

#### *Newsletters*

- |                  |                     |
|------------------|---------------------|
| December 6, 2000 | <i>Street Smart</i> |
| January 20, 2001 | <i>Street Smart</i> |
| February 7, 2001 | <i>Street Smart</i> |
| April 4, 2001    | <i>Street Smart</i> |

*RTP Presentations*

- |                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| 1 June 8, 2000     | City of Grand Terrace City Council     |
| 2 June 13, 2000    | City of Loma Linda City Council        |
| 3 June 20, 2000    | City of Redlands City Council          |
| 4 June 20, 2000    | City of Colton City Council            |
| 5 June 26, 2000    | City of Yucaipa City Council           |
| 6 August 30, 2000  | Goods Movement Roundtable              |
| 7 November 3, 2000 | Rotary Club of Colton                  |
| 8 January 12, 2001 | Southern California Leadership Network |

*Environmental Justice Community Dialogues*

- |                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| 9 January 31, 2001 | Community Dialogue with various community groups |
|--------------------|--|

*Electronic Town Hall*

- |                  |                                       |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| 10 July 20, 2000 | Inland Empire event (four subregions) |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|

*Business Roundtable Meeting*

- |                   |                                    |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| 11 March 29, 2001 | Inland Empire Economic Partnership |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|

***San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments****RTP Presentations*

- |                      |   |
|----------------------|---|
| 1 May 4, 2000        | San Gabriel Valley Council of Gov'ts Trans. Committee |
| 2 June 23, 2000      | San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership               |
| 3 September 21, 2000 | SGV Economic Outlook Conference 2000                  |

*Environmental Justice Community Dialogues*

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| 4 January 22, 2001 | Workshop #1 – Jackie Robinson Center        |
| 5 January 25, 2001 | Workshop #2 – Monterey Park City Hall       |
| 6 February 6, 2001 | Workshop #3 – Baldwin Park Community Center |

***South Bay Cities Council of Governments****Newsletters*

- |              |                        |
|--------------|------------------------|
| Fall, 1999   | <i>South Bay Watch</i> |
| Summer, 2000 | <i>South Bay Watch</i> |
| Fall, 2000   | <i>South Bay Watch</i> |
| Winter, 2000 | <i>South Bay Watch</i> |
| Winter, 2001 | <i>South Bay Watch</i> |

*RTP Presentations*

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| 1 January 27, 2000 | SBCCOG Board of Directors                     |
| 2 April 24, 2000   | Carson Coordinating Council                   |
| 3 April 26, 2000   | South Bay Economic Development Partnership    |
| 4 May 19, 2000     | South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce |

5	June 5, 2000	Torrance Chamber of Commerce
6	June 26, 2000	Redondo Beach Senior Citizens
7	August 23, 2000	Rotary Club of Hawthorne
8	September 28, 2000	South Bay Council of Governments
9	January 11, 2001	El Segundo Rotary Club
10	January 18, 2001	Westchester/LAX Transportation Management Association
11	January 22, 2001	League of Women Voters Beach Cities
12	January 25, 2001	Redondo Beach Public Works Commission
13	January 25, 2001	South Bay Association of Chambers of Commerce
14	February 7, 2001	Rancho Palos Verdes Senior Citizens
15	February 26, 2001	Redondo Beach Senior Citizens
16	March 8, 2001	Torrance Transportation Network

*Environmental Justice Community Dialogue*

17	June 15, 2000	Hawthorne (Hawthorne Memorial Building)
18	January 24, 2001	Service Planning Area 8 Regional Council Meeting
19	February 20, 2001	Dana Strand Public Housing Resident Council
20	March 5, 2001	Osage Neighborhood Association-City of Inglewood
21	April 2, 2001	LAX Expansion No-City of Inglewood

*Electronic Town Hall*

21	November 28, 2000	Combined event with Gateway Council of Governments
----	-------------------	--

**Ventura Council of Governments**

*RTP Presentations*

1	December 7, 2000	Oxnard Workshop
---	------------------	-----------------

*Environmental Justice Community Dialogues*

2	November 15, 2000	Oxnard Community Dialogue
---	-------------------	---------------------------

**Western Riverside Council of Governments**

*Newsletter*

July/August, 1999	WRCOG Notes
September, 1999	WRCOG Notes

*RTP Presentations*

1	April 3, 2000	WRCOG Board of Directors
2	September 25, 2000	Riverside County Transportation Commission
3	January 10, 2001	Riverside Monday Morning Group
4	January 18, 2001	Riverside Co. Trans. Comm. Technical Advisory Cmte.
5	January 25, 2001	The Exchange Club
6	February 5, 2001	WRCOG Executive Committee

*Environmental Justice Community Dialogue*

- |                    |   |
|--------------------|---|
| 7 January 11, 2001 | Second Baptist Church – The Group           |
| 8 January 18, 2001 | Institute of Transportation Engineers Group |

*Electronic Town Hall*

- |                 |                                       |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|
| 9 July 20, 2000 | Inland Empire event (four subregions) |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|

*Business Roundtable Meeting*

- |                   |                                    |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|
| 10 March 29, 2001 | Inland Empire Economic Partnership |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|

***Westside Cities****Environmental Justice Community Dialogue*

- |               |  |
|---------------|--|
| July 27, 2000 | East Culver City Neighborhood Alliance |
|---------------|--|

***Regional****Conferences*

- |                  |                       |
|------------------|-----------------------|
| 1 March 31, 2000 | Transportation Summit |
| 2 March 30, 2001 | E-Commerce Conference |

*RTP Presentations*

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| 3 July 13, 2000     | Building Industry Association of Southern California |
| 4 July 20, 2000     | Inland Empire Electronic Town Hall                   |
| 5 November 11, 2000 | Southern California Transit Advocates                |
| 6 March 21, 2001    | LACMTA Citizens Advisory Committee                   |

*Environmental Justice Community Dialogues*

- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| 7 January 5, 2001   | SCAG Environmental Justice Meeting (EJ Leadership) |
| 8 February 22, 2001 | Asian Pacific Policy and Planning Council          |
| 9 March 5, 2001     | SCAG Environmental Justice Meeting (EJ Leadership) |
| 10 March 11, 2001   | The Muslim Public Affairs Council                  |
| 11 March 13, 2001   | The Ethnic Coalition                               |

*Business Roundtable Meetings*

- |                   |                    |
|-------------------|--------------------|
| 12 March 29, 2001 | Inland Empire      |
| 13 April 2, 2001  | Orange County      |
| 14 April 3, 2001  | Los Angeles County |

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
2001 DRAFT REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN  
PUBLIC AGENCY COMMENTS**

ORG.  GENERAL COMMENTS RECEIVED (Letters, Phone or Faxes)	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>CA Assembly-member Fran Pavley</p> <p>Fran Pavley Assemblymember State Capital P. O. Box 942849 Sacramento, CA 94249-0041</p>	<p>1. I am concerned that in the recommended project listing, the Draft RTP still contains no significant highway projects on the 101 anywhere from Highway 23 to downtown Los Angeles. Also, the A.M. / P.M. traffic commute pattern has now completely reversed in roughly five years. This should trigger a fresh look at RTP strategies, especially from Hwy 23 to the 170.</p> <p>2. There is a pressing need for the approved Warner Center Transit Hub to encourage transit use. However, I am very concerned that a park-and-ride component was not included in the Hub's current plan. The exclusion of accessible public parking will greatly minimize the Transit Hub's effectiveness. I would encourage transportation agencies to fund a park-and-ride facility in conjunction with the Transit Hub.</p> <p>3. Although the Rapid Bus system has been well received as a connector to the Universal City subway, there are no park-and-ride lots along</p>	<p>1. SCAG recognizes the importance of the US-101 corridor. The baseline includes a ramp improvement project on I-405 NB to US-101 EB, which is part of the Governor's Traffic Congestion Relief Plan. The Governor's Plan also provides for a study of the corridor; this Major Investment Study (MIS) will be conducted jointly by MTA and SCAG. Furthermore, US-101 is indicated as a long-range corridor in the Draft RTP.</p> <p>2, 3 As the region's rideshare agency, SCAG supports the development of park and ride lots to encourage ridesharing. The plan proposes over \$200 million regionwide for the development of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures, which include park and ride lots.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>4. Governor Davis has proposed a busway along Chandler and Burbank Blvd., which should include adequate parking. As a long-term strategy, I also support revisiting light rail or other mass transit or multi-modal options both E/W and N/S to span the San Fernando Valley, and on the 405 freeway from the 101 to LAX.</p> <p>5. Bike lanes are at a premium, and yet provide another means for people to travel short distances outside their cars. This is a transit issue as well as a recreational one.</p> <p>6. Pacific Coast Highway has serious traffic safety issues which must be included in the RTP. There is a PCH Taskforce initiated by State Senator Sheila Kuehl. One of its goals is to coordinate and increase communication between Malibu and Santa Monica on these issues. I hope that the work of this group will be incorporated into the RTP.</p> <p>7. Air quality standards must be maintained. I</p>	<p>4. Comment noted. The plan proposes a North/South Valley Transit Corridor on Van Nuys Blvd. Adequate parking for a transit project such as the San Fernando Busway is critical to its success. The LACMTA has not yet determined the transit mode for N/S corridor that is to feed into the busway. They are expected to look at a multitude of options.</p> <p>5. Comment noted. The plan proposes over \$700 million nationwide for non-motorized transportation.</p> <p>6. SCAG recognizes the importance of traffic safety; it is one of the plan's performance indicators. While work from this taskforce may not be incorporated into the current RTP due to time constraints, SCAG will ensure that it will be included in the next iteration of the RTP.</p> <p>7. Comment noted.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>strongly support the use of clean-burning fuels to prevent the degradation of the regional air quality. My bill, AB1058, would authorize the CARB to formulate and implement a program for the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions from passenger cars and light-duty trucks.</p> <p>8. I support the comments by Russ Dingman, California D.O.P.&amp;R. regarding the sensitivity that needs to be given to lighting, signage, wildlife corridors, etc. in areas where traffic and transit traverse open space and more rural areas.</p> <p>9. Most importantly, there must be a concerted effort to focus on Smart Growth Strategies. The statement in the Executive Summary that “growth in the region is inevitable” may be obvious. But, it is also a warning that transportation and other long-range planning must be focused on improvements to the system that do not at the same time encourage urban sprawl, thus undercutting the very purpose of this and other SCAG work.</p>	<p>8. Comment noted. The RTP Program EIR addresses the effects of the plan on biological resources, aesthetics and views, etc. See response to Letter S8 in Response to Comments, Final PEIR Addendum, April 2001.</p> <p>9. The challenges of future population and employment growth and their effect on traffic congestion, transportation investment choices, air quality and housing needs are significant long-range planning issues. In response, SCAG has created the Growth Visioning Subcommittee to inform, engage and facilitate consensus on a “Vision” - a strategy for addressing the challenging consequences of anticipated growth in the region. Specifically, this Subcommittee will provide a policy framework for growth forecasts; provide direction on producing alternative urban form scenarios; consider balanced and efficient growth and transportation patterns; and consider other sustainable development and environmental issues.</p>
CA Senator Jack Scott	<p>Jack Scott Senator, 21<sup>st</sup> District California State Senate 215 N. Marengo Avenue, #103 Pasadena, CA 91101</p>	<p>See Response to Letter S1 in Response to Comments, Final PEIR Addendum, April 2001.</p> <p>I understand that the SCAG staff recently made a projection of 9.4 million passengers at the Burbank airport by 2025. This estimate doubles the 4.75 passengers the airport hosted in 2000.</p> <p>2. Frankly, I don't see how it could be possible either by the expansion of the present terminal or the existing terminal remaining as is. I feel</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		that this number of people would be inadequately served in terms of restroom accommodation, baggage claim, curb parking, and other items at an airport. This also would lead to a gridlock within the terminal building, and also outside of the terminal. I would request that SCAG look at this study in order to predict a more realistic situation for the Burbank airport.	
California Air Resources Board	Ms. Lynn Terry Deputy Executive Officer Air Resources Board 1001 I Street P. O. Box 2815 Sacramento, CA 95612 916/322-2739 <a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov">www.arb.ca.gov</a>	<p>1. The design and funding of the transportation system, as defined in the RTP, are key to ensure we meet our common goals of increased mobility and clean air in the region.</p> <p>2. Since the transportation system is the largest contributor to air pollution in Southern California, it must be the primary source of emission reductions as well</p> <p>3. SCAG is well-versed in the transportation conformity requirements that demand vehicle emissions meet the budgets in the applicable State Implementation Plan (SIP) to obtain federal approval and funding. But the total vehicle emissions considered in the conformity analysis are just one of the air quality "tests" that we must satisfy. The approved 1999 Ozone SIP for the South Coast Air Basin includes federally-enforceable commitments by ARB, SCAG, and the South Coast Air Quality Management District (District) to reduce vehicle emissions – we must all fulfill our respective</p>	<p>1. Comments noted.</p> <p>2. Comments noted.</p> <p>3. Comments noted.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>4. It is clear that the new SIP will need to rely on the maximum feasible reductions from the transportation sector, through increased efficiency of the system as a whole, as well as cleaner vehicles. We have made considerable progress in meeting the NOx reduction goals in the approved SIP, but ROG reductions remain a formidable challenge. Since the 2001 RTP is scheduled for adoption before the new SIP, it is vital that the RTP proactively address this need. At a minimum, the RTP should clearly define how SCAG will fulfill its existing SIP obligations for the specified ROG reductions in each milestone year from 2002 through 2010.</p> <p>4. We agree that transportation is a key actor in addressed Air Quality. We have been working with all agencies to maintain the efficiency and effectiveness of the system. We are also working with subregions to identify even more reductions for time in the next AQMP. As technological controls get stronger effectiveness of RTP strategies are reduced. Plan is actively pursuing alternatives to SOV with transit/HOV programs and other actions.</p> <p>The Draft 2001 RTP has demonstrated transportation/air quality conformity findings for each air basin in SCAG region. Thus, SCAG has fulfilled its SIP obligations as defined in the 1999 Ozone SIP Amendment.</p> <p>5. The Transportation Conformity Report (Appendix H) indicates that the Draft RTP would achieve reductions of only 1.80 tons per day ROG and 0.15 tons per day NOx in 2010. SCAG staff indicates that the reductions are low because the air quality benefits of some projects not yet approved are built into the baseline emission projections. Since many of these projects are under development, the federal transportation conformity rule requires that they be placed in the "Plan" scenario, not in the baseline. We understand that SCAG staff is now working to pull these projects out of the baseline and reevaluate the emissions impact of the RTP with these and other changes. If the</p> <p>5. Baseline projects in the Draft 2001 RTP include all TIP projects, Governor's Projects (TCRP), and TEA-21 Priority projects. Because these baseline projects were approved by the TCC, the baseline definition for the 2001 RTP will remain the same for the purpose of RTP analysis. For conformity analysis, however, projects that are not subject to the defined baseline projects by the transportation conformity rules are pulled out of the RTP baseline and a new analysis will be incorporated into final conformity.</p> <p>Again, SCAG will meet the conformity requirements with regard to conformity requirements, SCAG's will meet the emission budgets established in the SIP.</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>6. There are other issues which affect the emissions impacts of this RTP, including uncertain funding of high speed rail and the late inclusion of Metropolitan Transportation Authority projects.</p> <p>6. Currently SCAG staff is working closely with subregions to identify local projects that are not included in the RTP, or projects included in the RTP but are not modeled for any emission reduction benefits. These emission reduction benefits are in addition to what have been shown in the draft plan. These additional emission reduction credits should be able to offset any shortfall associated with the absence of Maglev.</p> <p>7. Milestones will be added. Palmdale line is being moved to post 2010. We will share modeling results as they are available.</p> <p>7. <b>High Speed Rail</b> – The draft plan assumes completion of an intra-regional magnetic levitation (Maglev) high-speed rail system, with two major lines being completed by 2010. The addition of zero-emission rail projects would certainly benefit air quality in the region and we support SCAG's long-term effort and commitment. It is important, however, that the emission reductions Maglev is estimated to achieve in the SIP attainment year of 2010 become a reality. A schedule of near- and mid-term milestones for implementation and funding (both public and private) should be delineated in the RTP. And if completion of Maglev lines in 2010 is not realistic, SCAG needs to ensure that equivalent emission reductions will be achieved</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>We request that the result of model runs isolating the emission reduction impacts of the proposed Maglev system in 2010 and subsequent years be provided to ARB when they become available.</p> <p><b>8.</b> <b>Transit</b> - On-road reductions in the 1999 SIP depend in part on improvements to the region's public transit system. Prior to adoption of the 1998 RTP, SCAG staff reported that 55 percent of the 14 tons of ROG reductions needed to demonstrate conformity would come from transit restructuring, including emphasis on highly efficient rail and bus corridors fed by an extensive network of shuttles. That vision was not retained in the Draft 2001 RTP. However, the emission reductions attributed to transit system improvement in the SIP are still needed.</p>	<p>SCAG staff has worked closely with LACMTA staff in an attempt to achieve consistency between the RTP and the LRTP.</p> <p>As noted we will recommend MTA projects from this LRTP that are financially feasible. It should be noted however, this plan has not been endorsed by the MTA Board. We are pleased MTA staff has concluded they can recommend major strategies from the 98 RTP. During the prior three years the MTA staff were the leading opponents of these 1998 strategies because of cost.</p> <p>Many projects proposed by the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority (MTA) were not yet ready for inclusion in the Draft 2001 RTP at the time of its publication. Fortunately, MTA has recently completed its draft long-range plan, and there is still opportunity to include a significant transit improvement commitment in the 2001 RTP prior to adoption. MTA's current modeling indicates that projects in their draft long-range plan – most notably the "rapid bus" program – will boost transit mode split for commuters by 50 percent by 2025. This is a</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p><b>9. Transportation Demand Management (TDM)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reducing the demand for transportation provides important air quality benefits. The draft RTP includes many positive action items for strategic investment in TDM, including a substantial increase in the number of regional vanpools. SCAG staff has indicated that funding for TDM has increased from \$350 million in the 1998 RTP to \$580 million in the draft 2001 RTP. We support this increase, and suggest that the funding level be clearly specified in the final RTP document.</li> </ul> <p><b>9.</b> The 4.7 % in 2025 includes both telecommuting program and work at home. This is based on the historical trend estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The 2001 RTP allocates \$540 million total for TDM programs proposed in the plan to further ensure the success of the TDM programs including telecommuting by the year 2025.</p>
		<p><b>10.</b> The current modeling output for telecommuting is 2.9 percent of all commute trips. The draft RTP baseline assumes this will increase to 4.7 percent by 2025. SCAG's State of the Commute Survey indicates that the average telecommute mode split has been under 2 percent over the last decade, with no clear incremental increase. We suggest that the final RTP identify additional funding for programs to achieve the 4.7 percent goal.</p> <p><b>10.</b> Currently, the modeling process loops back congestion to trip distribution. SCAG's new Travel Demand Model is not yet capable of addressing the inter-</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>strongest possible vehicle activity estimates. Since the 1998 RTP, SCAG has completed key improvements in its travel forecasting process, including development of a truck model, used for the first time in the Draft 2001 RTP.</p> <p>Air quality and transportation plans must rely on the best data available; activity and forecasting data should be readily discernable and subject to the same level of public scrutiny as the inventories and control strategies they support. It is important to continue to improving the technical foundation of future SIPs, including the vehicle activity forecasting process. We look forward to working with SCAG staff on this effort.</p>	<p>action between land use and transportation. SCAG's Growth Visioning Committee will continue to deal with the issues associated with the land use and extreme congestion. (See response to California Assemblymember Fran Pavley, Bullet 9 for further information on this Committee.)</p> <p>One continuing modeling concern is the response of travelers and land uses to extreme congestion. Current modeling practices do not constrain network loading when congestion is severe. To produce realistic travel activity estimates for the planning process, our forecasting mechanisms need to account for travel behavior in response to severe congestion. In addition, travel forecasting should consider the effect of transportation infrastructure on the distribution of housing and employment.</p> <p>11. <b>Truck Lanes</b> – SCAG staff report significant emission reductions from construction of truck lanes on SR-60 and other facilities. To date,</p> <p>11. SCAG's Heavy Duty Truck (HDT) model is integrated with vehicle trips generated from the LDV and MDV during assignment phase. As the model outputs, the HDT model provides link-node VMT as input to DTIM to estimate</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>however, estimation of this benefit is derived from the faster travel by light duty vehicles that will occur initially as truck traffic is moved to four new designated lanes. As we stated in our comments on the 1998 RTP (and raised several times since then), the emissions impact must include assessment of: the effect of truck lanes on truck emissions, emission changes that may result from potential mode shifts in the freight sector, and additional light-duty travel that may result from reduced travel times in affected corridors. The new truck model should enable SCAG staff to more readily complete the needed analyses before emission reductions are assigned to truck lanes in the final 2001 RTP.</p>	<p>12. The 1999 Ozone SIP is the binding SIP until the next SIP is approved. The District has made commitment with other sources of emission reduction credits to off-set the Rule 2202 shortfall. Though the commitment was not included in the 1999 Ozone SIP Amendment, it was part of the approval process. Thus, emission reductions estimated for the 2001 RTP do not need to be adjusted.</p> <p>12. <b>Baseline Emission Reductions for Rule 2202 –</b> We understand that the emission reduction benefits of South Coast AQMD Rule 2202 are included in the baseline in the draft RTP conformity assessment. However, it is unclear whether these reductions, which are represented through factors that adjust EMFAC7G emissions prior to input to the Direct Travel Impact Model (DTIM), assume the employer size applicability threshold that is currently in place (250+ employees) or the threshold in place when the factors were developed (100+ employees). This matter should be clarified, and emissions estimates revised if necessary, prior to RTP adoption.</p> <p>13. Funding for Strategic Investments - SCAG staff has indicated that the RTP baseline will be Comments noted.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>altered to adhere to federal conformity regulations. This will no doubt substantially change the baseline and the Plan funding levels for the strategic investments categories listed in the draft RTP. To assess the relative value of the RTP's investments for air quality, it will be important that the Baseline versus Plan funding levels for the strategic investments be publicly available for discussion and comment before the adoption of the final RTP.</p> <p>14. <b>Alternative Funding Implementation</b>  <b>Strategy - ARB's low-emission vehicle program is critical to attaining federal and State air quality standards. In the long run, when there are large numbers of alternative fuel and zero-emission vehicles on the road in California, we understand SCAG's concern about the potential loss of fuel tax revenue. But until then, we need to encourage the development and deployment of those vehicles. Since the preliminary draft RTP acknowledged that the need for alternative revenue collection will not occur until 2010, we ask SCAG to clarify its intent by adding the following language to alternative funding strategy #3, on page 116 of the draft RTP:</b></p> <p>“3. No sooner than 2010, implement a revenue raising mechanism on alternative fuel vehicles that is equivalent to the gas tax (to recoup loss of revenues resulting from alternative fuel penetration).”</p> <p>1. We are very concerned over the proposal to create a four-lane truck facility with the SJC</p> <p>1-3  The proposed truck lane Report on SR-60 does not specify San Jose Creek as a potential alternative. The Regional Council of SCAG indicated that all feasible</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Services Agency	<p>Center California Health &amp; Human Services Agency            3530 West Pomona Boulevard            P. O. Box 100            Pomona, CA 91769-0100            909/595-1221            909/598-4352 – fax</p>	<p>right-of-way.</p> <p>2. After careful review of the SR-60 Truck Lane Feasibility Study Final Report dated November, 2000, we feel that the SJC proposal is not a prudent means of meeting the goals of the RTP.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Based on the information available to date, we feel that LDC has no choice but to vigorously oppose the SJC alternative.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>We request that we be closely involved with the project environmental assessment and development processes so that we can determine how to best provide you with the necessary input from our experts.</p>	<p>alternatives should be evaluated.</p> <p>4. All affected/interested parties need to be involved in the remaining phases of the evaluation.</p> <p>1. Comments noted and will be integrated into document.</p> <p><u><b>Draft RTP, Main Document</b></u>  <u><b>Page 5</b></u>            On the bottom of this page there is a statement concerning the regional necessity of coordinating future airport development. We concur with SCAG that the issues of future airport development is very complex requires greater regional oversight. We support any efforts to move in this direction.</p> <p>2.  <u><b>Aviation Scenario Evaluation – 2001 RTP Update</b></u>  <u><b>Chapter 3, Air Quality</b></u>            It appears through air quality impact modeling</p> <p>2.-9.            See Response to Letter S3 in Response to Comments, Final PEIR Addendum, April 2001, responses 55-67.</p>
Caltrans Aeronautics Division	<p>Caltrans Aeronautics Division            Department of Transportation            Aeronautics Programs MS40            P.O. Box 942874            Sacramento, CA 94274-0001</p>		

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>has been conducted on the various airport scenarios. Have these models taken into consideration the proposed MOU between the airlines at the major commercial airports in the South Coast Region and the air quality regulatory agencies? This MOU would greatly increase the number of zero or low emission ground service equipment (GSE) at these airports.</p> <p><u>3.</u> <u>Page 87, Aviation System Investments</u> The last sentence in the first paragraph under this heading states Palmdale and (potentially) Point Mugu are joint-use airports. March ARB should be added to that list, since it to, is a joint-use facility.</p>	<p><b>4. Volume 4 – Aviation Appendix</b> <u>Page 3, Noise Descriptors</u> Throughout the document the reference is made to “CNEL 65+”. We suggest this be changed to “65db CNEL” to better describe the term.</p> <p>The paragraph states; “...airport proprietors are required to ensure that all land uses are compatible with the aircraft noise environment or the airport proprietor must secure a variance from the California Department of Transportation.” Please note that PUC Section 5012 states that airports deemed noise sensitive by the county in which they are located are required to receive a variance from Caltrans.</p> <p>The same paragraph discusses Table 1 which</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>addresses FAR Part 150. We suggest this statement be placed in another paragraph in order to not confuse the reader between the California and Federal airport noise regulations.</p> <p>The paragraph may also identify the airports within the SCAG region, which have been identified as noise problem airports by the county. These airports are Los Angeles International, Burbank, Long Beach, John Wayne and Ontario. Van Nuys is also a noise problem airport however we are aware it is not included in the RTP discussion.</p>	<p>5. <u>Page 14, LAX Noise-Sensitive Land Use Impacts, Table 3</u>  The number of "Potential Person Impacts" is not included under the "1999 Official 65db Condition" column. The 1999 4<sup>th</sup> quarter LAX Noise Monitoring Report states that 78,026 people live within the LAX noise impact area.</p> <p>The "1999 INM Condition" column states 27,986 people live within the LAX noise impact area. How could there be such a large discrepancy between the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter report and 1999 INM?</p> <p>6. <u>Page 24, Ontario Noise-Sensitive Land Use Impacts, Table 5</u>  Same comment as in Table 3. The 1999 4<sup>th</sup> quarter Ontario Noise Monitoring Report states there are 2,098 people living within the 65db CNEL contour? The 199 INM Condition says</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>166 people are within the contour. This again seems to be a big difference.</p> <p><b>7.</b> <u>Page 32, Baseline Conditions</u> Should the official 1999 noise contour map be used in place of the 1999 INM? Isn't the official contour more accurate than the INM since it is based on monitoring data?</p> <p><b>8.</b> <u>Page 34, Noise-Sensitive Land Use Impacts,</u> <u>Table 7</u> Should data from the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter Noise Monitoring Report for John Wayne be included in this table? According to this report the are a total of 20.78 acres and 298 people living within the 65db CNEL contour.</p> <p>There is also no ‘Official 1999 Noise Contour Map for John Wayne as there is for the other airports.</p> <p><b>9.</b> <u>Page 41, Baseline Conditions</u> First paragraph says the 4<sup>th</sup> quarter 1998 Noise Impact Report for Burbank was used. Should it be the 1999 report?</p>	
Caltrans District 7	Stephen J. Buswell IGR/CEQA Program Manager Transportation Planning Office Caltrans – District 7 120 So. Spring Street Los Angeles, CA 90012		<p><b>1.</b> The Transportation Congestion Relief Program (TCRP) and Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) projects are included in the RTP as the “Baseline Investments”. However, the TCRP and RTIP are dynamic documents that are regularly</p> <p>1. The projects identified with partial or full construction funding in the currently adopted TCRP and RTIP are considered baseline projects in the 2001 RTP. For the purposes of long range transportation planning, these projects are considered committed projects upon which the RTP does not have any further discretion. However, any future RTIP amendment must be consistent with the RTP and not vice versa. If an overriding <b>need</b> for adopting an RTIP amendment that is</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
213/897-6696  213/897-8906	amended as project design and funding availability fluctuates. Due to the fragility of the air quality conformity findings, the RTP remains static for a period of three years. Explanation is needed to clarify how changes to the Baseline projects impact the RTP, the air quality conformity finding, and federal approval of environmental documents. Projects in the amended TCRP and RTP may change dramatically from the descriptions in the RTP. Will these amended projects be a part of the constrained plan and be allowed to progress if their descriptions differ from the RTP?	<p>inconsistent with the adopted RTP can be demonstrated, an interim amendment of the RTP may be initiated.</p> <p>2. Further explanation is needed on how the 2001 RTP impacts future RTIPs. Clarification is needed as to whether future RTIPs are limited to adding only projects identified in the constrained RTP project list.</p> <p>3. Additional clarity is needed to define the “Constrained” project list. We assume that the arterial improvements and grade crossings are considered to be financially constrained projects. However, lacking the word “constrained” in the headings that identify these projects allows too much room for interpretation.</p> <p>4. Again, any new project considered for RTIP amendment must be consistent with the adopted RTP. Consistency can be demonstrated by direct reference to a project in the constrained list of projects associated with the RTP or by demonstrating consistency with an RTP policy.</p> <p>3. Constrained list of projects should not be interpreted as specific commitment to funding. Federal regulations require that the projects and programs identified in the RTP can be funded reasonably in the identified time table. This is primarily the reason why a constrained list of projects must be identified in the RTP. Unlike RTIP list of projects, the RTP constrained project list identifies projects that are fairly regionally significant and project descriptions are framed to the extent possible to allow some flexibility in developing programs to implement the projects without the need to amend the RTP. Arterial projects as well as a separate list of grade crossing projects are constrained to the extent that funding is available as identified in the primary constrained list under respective funding category. This is meant to provide the flexibility for the implementing agencies to develop and program projects as they become ready.</p> <p>4.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>The “Unconstrained” project list could be made more meaningful by adding more detail on its intended uses. Information is needed to show whether these projects were modeled in any capacity and if they are expected to be used for future RTIPs. Clarity is also needed to determine whether projects can be moved up from the unconstrained list to the constrained list.</p> <p>5. The description of Amtrak service is at the end of the “Commuter Rail” section. Instead, it should be under a section titled “Intercity Rail” or “Interregional Transit”, since it is not specifically intended for commuters. Also, state support for the service should be mentioned. We suggest the following intercity rail text: “Amtrak, in conjunction with the Caltrans Rail Program, provides inter-city service, principally between San Diego and San Luis Obispo”.</p> <p>6. Need to reconcile with LACMTA on the Los Angeles County information. Truck lanes on Route 60 are not feasible as described in the RTP and could lead to higher pollutants. MAGLEV also may not be feasible and may have more impacts than stated. Need to reassess impacts and mitigation once LA County information is corrected.</p> <p>7. Overall, the SCAG draft is a discussion about a plan. It is not specific enough to address major roles or responsibilities. The funding</p>	<p>Unconstrained list of projects is simply a wish list of projects and does not have any legal standing in the RTP. It is simply meant to provide a sense of the magnitude of the transportation improvement needs in the region. It is neither analyzed nor prioritized, nor used in determining the conformity findings.</p> <p>5. Comment noted. Appropriate revision has been incorporated into the final plan to highlight the role of Amtrak in our regional transportation system.</p> <p>6. SCAG staff has worked closely with LACMTA staff in an attempt to achieve consistency between the RTP and the LRTP. However, the truck lanes on SR-60 as well as the regional Maglev system have been deemed to be significant regional transportation projects from the conformity perspective as well as regional mobility needs. The RTP PEIR evaluates the impacts of these projects at a programmatic level.</p> <p>7. A Regional Transportation Plan is a policy and planning document that provides the framework for investment in our regional transportation plan over the next 20 plus years. The major roles and responsibilities of various agencies in</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>projections of approximately \$10 billion are not realistic nor are there clearly defined consequences of not having these funds. Also, there are a lot of actions without corresponding responsibilities (who is responsible, when to be completed, and consequences of non-performance).</p> <p>Exh. 5.3 in the Community Link 21 document does not correctly show a regionally significant baseline project on Rt.58. Rt.58 from the Kern/San Bernardino County Line to a point 7.5 miles east of Rt. 395 (PM 0.0/12.9) is included in the RTIP as a four-lane expressway for P &amp; E only. We believe this portion of Rt.58 should be included as a mixed flow project in Exh. 5.3</p>	<p>implementing transportation projects are dictated by applicable state and federal laws. It is neither appropriate nor necessary for a regional transportation plan to address this issue.</p> <p>The project in question does not appear in Exhibit 5.3 because it is outside the extent of the map area. However, the project is included in the baseline project list in the Appendix.</p> <p>Exh. 5.5 in the Community Link 21 document shows Highway and Corridor projects. This Exh. Should be corrected to show all of Rt. 395 from the I-15/395 Junction to the San Bernardino/Kern County Line (PM 4.0/73.5). Additionally, the High Desert Corridor (HDC) is shown incorrectly. The Exh. Depicts the HDC from Palmdale, southeasterly to a point near the Junction of Rts. 18 and 138. The correct alignment for the HDC is from Palmdale easterly to Victorville to a point beyond the Junction of Rt. 18 and I-15. We can provide the correct alignment on the Exh. And send it to you as a fax. Finally, a symbol for an HOV Connector at the east junction of Rt. 60 and I-215 near Moreno Valley should be added to this Exh.</p> <p>The project in question does not appear in Exhibit 5.3 because it is outside the extent of the map area. However, the project is included in the baseline project list in the Appendix.</p> <p>--Exhibit 5.5 only depicts the portion of US-395 (from I-15 to 0.6 mi. north of Desert Flower) that is in the constrained portion of the plan. The remaining portion, from Desert Flower to the Kern County Line, is in the unconstrained portion of the plan.</p> <p>--The Exhibit was changed to show the correct alignment for the High Desert Corridor.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
COMMENTS		
	<p>10. Exh. 8.1 in the Community Link 21 shows Rt. 395 as a post 2025 long-range corridor. Rt. 395 should be deleted from this Exh., but included in Exh. 5.5 as suggested above.</p> <p>11. Table 5.5 on Page 62 should be corrected to show the addition of the HOV connector at the east junction of Rt. 60 and I-215. The “Proposed Implementation Schedule” should be year 2010, the “Jurisdiction” is Riverside, and the “Project Development Requirement&gt;Status” is PSR complete PAED pending.</p> <p>12. On pages 2 and 29 of the draft plan, it was noted that 1998 growth forecasts for year 2020 were overstated. In retrospect, what was the reason for the over projection? What new methodology was used in the 2001 plan to provide a more realistic growth rate? Table 1.1, shows a declining population growth trend. What is the reason for declining growth trend? Was the revised population projection obtained from the State Department of Finance?</p> <p>13. On page 3, provide additional information on “Consent Decree” that required LACMTA to purchase additional buses and increase bus transit service. Was this a court mandate or was the plan addressing Title VI requirements?</p> <p>14.</p>	<p>10. Exhibit 8.1 was corrected.</p> <p>11. The project in question has already been supplied to SCAG by RCTC. However, RCTC provided a different completion year of 2025, and a different project status of “PSR Needed.”</p> <p>12. One of two major factors (in addition to in-migration) to account for population growth is natural increase. The recent annual natural increase between 1994 and 1997 has gone down compared to annual natural increase between 1991 and 1994. The assumption of reduced annual natural increase was factored in to the March 2001 growth forecast. Local subregional input was also considered in the forecast development process. The job forecast was adjusted downward to maintain an unemployment rate of 5%. The SCAG growth forecast was developed independently of the California State Department of Finance population projection.</p> <p>13. Staff will consider adding information on the Consent Decree. The LACMTA is obligated by a court mandate to increase bus transit service.</p> <p>14.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE
	<p>The proposed new alternative funding sources identified on page 4 and addressed in detail Chapter VI relies heavily on local voters approval and on the willingness of statewide voters to approve a tax increase. While the assumptions of tax extensions and increase are not unrealistic it should not be relied on as a solid base of funding for the region. The impact of the failure of the new tax measures should be clearly stated. Federal funding policies require projected funding sources that should be reasonably expected to be available.</p>	<p>There have been some revisions to the funding strategy identified in the RTP. The strategy is as follows: 1) Continue the state sales tax on gasoline for transportation purposes. 2) Continue local transportation sales taxes where necessary (note, extension is not assumed in Orange County and imposition is not assumed in Ventura County. 3) Adjust the state motor vehicle fuel excise tax and user-fee to maintain historical purchasing power. This proposal includes implementing a revenue raising mechanism on alternative fuels beginning in the year 2010, assuming a rate that is equivalent to the current gasoline tax. Additionally, this proposal includes adjusting all fuel taxes by a total of 10 cents within a five-year time span. That is, an increase of 5 cents in 2010, and then an increase of 1 penny annually through 2015.</p> <p>SCAG maintains that these are reasonably expected available revenue sources. SCAG will provide further discussion of these proposals, including implementation efforts.</p> <p>15. On page 5, at the bottom of the page, there is a statement concerning the regional necessity of coordinating future airport development. We concur with SCAG that issues of future airport development are very complex and require greater regional oversight. We support any efforts to move in this direction.</p> <p>16. On page 6, it may be helpful to re-identify the 9 major transit corridors identified in the 1998 RTP.</p> <p>17. On page 7, paragraph 7, line 4, please, clarify whether emissions budget approved by EPA can or cannot be used for conformity determination.</p> <p>18. On page 11, we suggest that the top paragraph</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>19. On page 14 of the draft plan, regional goal #4 identified the needs of the elderly and handicapped as issues to be addressed, yet the draft plan was silent on ADA issues.</p> <p>20. On pages 15 and 16, the objectives were not addressed. Also, we do not see the relationship of the goals mentioned on page 14 with the policies on pages 15 and 16 and the products on pages 21 through 23.</p> <p>21. On page 18, table 3.1, objectives were not identified for Accessibility, Safety and Livable Communities performance indicators. Also, the table identifies some objectives but what is the current performance to measure change? We suggest that a table be included to identify current level.</p> <p>22. On page 18 of the draft, table 3.1, it was noted that a consensus could not be reached on the issue of livable communities. Why was it not possible to reach a consensus?</p> <p>23. Also, on pages 97 through 100, the draft described land use transportation, livable communities and jobs housing in balance. Other than proposed studies and action plans, the draft</p>	<p>should acknowledge or address state requirements.</p> <p>19. ADA compliance can be assured only at the implementation stage. Goal # 4 is intended to ensure that the ADA requirements are fully considered and met when the projects are implemented.</p> <p>20. Comment noted.</p> <p>21. Comment noted. Objectives will be clarified in the final RTP to the appropriate extent.</p> <p>22-23. Clarification of these issues will be presented in the final RTP to the appropriate extent.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>did not fully analyze or specify how the problem would be addressed in the long term.</p> <p>24. On page 37, the last sentence shows "CAA" What is CAA?</p> <p>25. Rail transportation is a major mode in the SCAG region. Apart from the brief mention on page 48, this mode of transportation was not adequately addressed. In addition to SCRRRA, the Coaster provides service from Oceanside to Union Station in LA. Also, Amtrak provides six round-trip services from LA Union Station to Santa Barbara and San Luis Obispo and 12 round-trips between Los Angeles and San Diego. Currently annual ridership in Pacific Surfliner (former San Diegan) corridor is in excess of 1,100,000 annually. The Governor's TCR program provided several million dollars through year 2006 for various rail projects in the SCAG region. Did SCAG meet with Amtrak and Coaster authorities to discuss future capital investment plans for the corridor and its impact on the RTP? Also, the High Speed Rail Authority is analyzing the feasibility of a High-speed Rail system that runs between LA and San Diego and LA and San Francisco. This major study should be considered in the draft plan because if voters approve high-speed rail system it may compete for available state resources with projects listed in SCAG's RTP.</p> <p>26. What process was used in prioritizing of projects</p> <p>24. CAA stands for Clean Air Act. This is explained on page 6 of the RTP Draft.</p> <p>25. Comment noted. Portions of the Amtrak upgrade for the region were included in the 2001 RTP, as well as the Governor's congestion relief program. SCAG has been working with Amtrak and other regional providers through the Southern California Interregional Rail Committee.</p> <p>26. The process used to prioritize projects for the RTP involved several</p>		

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>for the RTP? Does SCAG use a rating procedure to screen out projects? When projects are selected are they based on cost, environmental issues, smart growth, congestion reduction considerations?</p> <p>27. On page 66, it was noted that the TCC has adopted a goal of maintaining the 1997 annual per capita ridership of 34.9 trips per person. How does this goal compare with other major MPOs in the country?</p> <p>28. On page 67, paragraph 3, please insert "in the" between proposed and Governor's plan.</p> <p>29. The draft RTP did not address how SCAG determines the deficiency of existing bus and rail fleet. Are surveys done to determine deficiencies in the regions transit fleet? Many transit agencies use Caltrans 10-Year State Highway Operation and Protection Program, generally known as SHOPP to determine cost effective rehabilitation strategy. How much resource is set-aside for rehabilitation of vehicles? With regard to air quality issues, there should be discussion on how the regions' aging buses will be replaced with low emission vehicles.</p> <p>27. It is generally difficult to compare this region to any other, due to its vast nature. In the future, the Regional Transit Task Force will look at this in more detail. The Task Force hopes to hold several workshops where discussions will take place with other national agencies, transit operators, etc. so that we all may have an opportunity to share information and learn from one another's experiences.</p> <p>28. Suggested editorial changes will be considered for inclusion in the final plan.</p> <p>29. Our baseline cost assessment, which include rehabilitation and replacement, is not based on needs, rather it is based on current expenditure levels. We have assumed reasonable funding for rehabilitation and replacement of both bus and rail vehicles.</p> <p>SCAG has not to date taken a position on an alternative fuels standard for transit vehicles. The Transportation and Communications Committee was concerned that South Coast Air Quality Management District and State Air Resources Board rules would have negative economic impacts on the local cities. SCAG realizes the importance of clean fuels but does not want to interfere with the ability of local operators to deliver public transit.</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>30. On page 71, last paragraph, second word, please, replace "lcal" with local.</p> <p>31. On page 82, first paragraph the Governor's TCRP provides several million dollars for rail project in the Alameda corridor. It should be mentioned.</p> <p>32. On page 91, actions are identified. The plan should identify how these actions would be specifically implemented.</p> <p>33. On page 92, the last sentence of third paragraph, reverse commute was referenced. "Reverse Commute" is an emerging new transportation issue, which could be addressed in the RTP. This may be connected to Title VI and environmental justice issues because a majority of those affected are low income and inner city residents.</p> <p>34. On page 94, the assumption that electronic commerce is efficient needs to be addressed.</p> <p>35. On page 95, the Draft recommends some actions on investments in Non-Motorized transportation, which agency(s) will have the responsibility for these actions?</p> <p>36.</p>	<p>30. Suggested editorial changes will be considered for inclusion in the final plan.</p> <p>31. See Response to bullet #1 above.</p> <p>32. SCAG is not an implementing agency. SCAG will work with the implementing agencies, including the county transportation commissions and Caltrans.</p> <p>33. Comment noted.</p> <p>34. Comment noted.</p> <p>35. Implementation of bikeway and pedestrian walkway projects are typically carried out by the county transportation commissions and local governments.</p> <p>36.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE
RTP			RTP
	On page 96, SCAG should identify the action it is taking for implementing ITS.	SCAG is not an implementing agency. SCAG will work with the implementing agencies, including the county transportation commissions and Caltrans.	
37.	On page 116, the funding alternatives are a wish list. It is not identified who has responsibility for implementing the alternative funding strategy. Also, alternatives are weak and the assumptions made in identifying the alternatives need to be identified.	Refer to comment no. 14.	
38.		The Draft RTP described the public involvement process in developing the plan. What was the participation rate from the public? Was the public participation process successful? The draft did not identify Native American Tribal Governments within the SCAG region or how they were involved in the development of the RTP. It would be helpful to have this information available.	SCAG's RTP outreach team implemented a comprehensive outreach program which will be fully documented in a separate report, including evaluation methods and techniques. This report will respond to your issues and questions.
39.		Actions and investment plans of the private sector will have a substantial impact on the RTP. How were they involved in the development of the process?	The private sector, represented by the railway owners, the Trucking Association, Auto Club, etc., were involved early on in the process through the task force structure that was established to update the plan.
		<b>Exclusive Truck Lanes</b>	
40.		Draft RTP refers to potential exclusive truck lane projects along State Route 60 (SR 60), Interstate 15 (I-15), Interstate 5 (I-5), and Interstate 710 (I-710) corridors. You may wish to insert, "specific sections of concern are as	Comment noted.

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>follows:"</p> <p>41. Page 78, Truck Lanes and Truck Climbing Lanes - The last paragraph on page 78 describes proposed general design features and costs for truck lanes in the SR 60 and 1-1 5 corridors.</p> <p>42. Please note that although the recently completed SR 60 Exclusive Truck Lane Feasibility Study concludes that constructing exclusive truck lanes is technically feasible, the study results showed exclusive truck lanes are less effective than other infrastructure improvements, i.e., mixed flow lanes, high occupancy vehicle lanes, other alternatives, or a combination of alternatives. And based on these conclusions, the Study recommended as the next step the development of a major multi-modal corridor analysis with engineering and environmental documentation that can be used for Project Study Reports (PSRs) for high priority projects; that analysis should include freight management techniques and capacity improvements for mixed-flow traffic as well as trucks. As such, we recommend the RTP remove reference to exclusive truck lane projects in the constrained plan, and instead, reflect the aforementioned conclusions.</p>	<p>41. Comment noted.</p> <p>42. The SR-60 Truck Lane Feasibility Study does not show mixed flow or HOV lanes to be more effective than truck lanes. In fact, the study conclusively shows that investing in truck lanes is significantly more cost-effective in adding capacity to the SR-60 than simply adding mixed flow lanes. Specifically, the SR-60 report concluded that the addition of 4 truck lanes on the SR-60 could eliminate the need for as many as 3 mixed flow lanes in each direction by 2020.</p> <p>43. Comment noted.</p> <p>43. In Section V, page 76 and Appendix E, page E-5 the Calexico East Port of Entry is not mentioned in the Goods Movement Section of the RTP despite the contribution of the Calexico East POE to goods movement throughout the SCAG</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
COMMENTS		
	<p>planning area. Calexico East was responsible for \$8.1 billion in trade during 1999, according to U.S. Census Bureau figures. Calexico East's trade figures represent more than 27% of the California-Mexico land trade, second only to the Otay Mesa POE. During 1999, U.S. Customs figures show that 500,000 trucks passed through the Calexico East POE (both Ways). The number of truck trips is expected to double by the year 2020. In addition, Caltrans has included 1-8, SR-7, SR-78, SR-86, and SR-111 in the ICES System (Intermodal Corridors of Economic Significance) due to the growing goods movement traffic through the Calexico East POE. Caltrans has several projects programmed to help ease congestion on the northbound trade corridor. The Brawley bypass, expansion of SR-111 and construction of SR-7 from SR 98 to 1-8 are programmed projects developed to accommodate the growing goods movement traffic demand in the area. In addition to northbound/southbound highway improvements, there is discussion about repairing and reopening the San Diego and Arizona East Railway which would enhance east/west goods movement from Imperial County. Calexico East POE is a growing land port of entry and should be included in the RTP goods movement section</p>	<p>44.</p> <p>In Section V, page 76 and Appendix E, page E-5 add a paragraph in which you discuss agricultural and maquiladora products from Imperial County and the Mexicali area.</p> <p>45.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>In Section V, Page 89, Table 5.17, PMD is the abbreviation used for Palmdale, however in the Legend PLM is designated as the abbreviation for Palmdale. The abbreviations should be consistent.</p> <p>46. In Section VII, Page 128, The PM10 and Ozone tables show no budget figures for Imperial County although in Appendix H, Section 11, Page 14 there are budget figures shown. The two sets of tables should be consistent. In addition, a footnote should be added to Section VII explaining that Imperial County is a transitional ozone non-attainment areas and that no attainment demonstration has been submitted for PM10, and therefore, no emissions budgets are currently applicable for Imperial County.</p>
		<p>47. Page 60, Exhibit 5.5, "2025 Draft Plan, Highway &amp; Corridor Projects" – Currently, the map shows the High Desert Corridor following State Route 138 (SR 138), from State Route 14 (SR 14) to the San Bernardino County line. Please refer to the attached map for the recommended corridor area.</p>
		<p>48. Page 140, Exhibit 8.1, "Post 2025 Long-Range Corridors" - Please refer to the attached map for the recommended corridor alignment for this exhibit.</p> <p>49. The Draft RTP document did not include</p>
		<p>Suggested editorial changes will be considered for inclusion in the final plan.</p> <p>46. First, at the time the draft RTP was released, information was not yet available for Imperial County. Secondly, numbers shown in Appendix H, Section II, page 14 are numbers of the plan (build) vs. the baseline (no-build). This is due to no emission budgets available currently applicable for Imperial County with regard to PM10.</p> <p>47. Exhibit 5.5 has been corrected to show the correct alignment for the High Desert Corridor.</p> <p>48. Appropriate revision has been incorporated into the final plan.</p> <p>49. Comment noted. The referenced checklist is a guideline and has been used in</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>"Appendix A" checklist, the California Transportation Commission requires that RTP be accompanied by a checklist. The checklist is the supporting documentation to assure conformity with the RTP Guidelines and a condition for acceptance of the regional RTIP. Caltrans will use the checklist to evaluate the adequacy of both the Draft RTP and the Final RTP.</p> <p>50. In Appendix E, page E-15, NAFTA (safety/INS/etc.) reference should be made to the safety standards and truck inspection data from the California Vehicle Enforcement Facility (CVEF), located just north of the Calexico East POE. CVEF data should be used in SCAG's development of adequate truck operational and safety standards.</p> <p>51. In Appendix E, there is no Matrix of issues, problems and potential solutions for land ports.</p> <p>52. In Appendix E, page E-35, Factor 7, Definition:, change the word increase to the past tense in the second sentence to read, "...promotes increased competition... ,"</p> <p>53. In Appendix E, page E-40, Paragraph 3, change the first word in the second sentence to "This" instead of "The," to read: "This would affect residences.</p> <p>the preparation of the 2001 RTP.</p>		

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		54. In Appendix H, page 16, the last sentence in the last paragraph should specify that although Imperial County is a non-attainment area for PM <sub>10</sub> , fugitive dust from construction is not a significant contributor to the problem. Otherwise, Imperial County should be listed as a non-attainment area for PM10.
		55. Chapter 3, Air Quality It appears through air quality impact modeling has been conducted on the various airport scenarios. Have these models taken into consideration the proposed MOU between the airlines at the major commercial airports in the South Coast Region and the air quality regulatory agencies? This MOU would greatly increase the number of zero or low emission ground service equipment (GSE) at these airports.
		56. Page 87, Aviation System Investments The last sentence in the first paragraph under this heading states Palmdale and (potentially) Point Mugu are joint-use airports. March ARB should be added to that list, since it is, a joint-use facility.
		<b>Volume 4 – Aviation Appendix</b>
		57. Page 3, Noise Descriptors – Throughout the document the reference is made to "CNEL 65+". We suggest this be changed to "65db CNEL" to better describe the term.

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>58. The paragraph states; "I.. .airport proprietors are required to ensure that all land uses are compatible with the aircraft noise environment or the airport proprietor must secure a variance from the California Department of Transportation." Please note that PUC Section 5012 states that airports deemed noise sensitive by the county in which they are located are required to receive a variance from Caltrans.</p> <p>59. The same paragraph discusses Table 1 which addresses FAR Part 150. We suggest this statement be placed in another paragraph in order to not confuse the reader between the California and Federal airport noise regulations.</p> <p>60. The paragraph may also identify the airports within the SCAG region, which have been identified as noise problem airports by the county. These airports are Los Angeles International, Burbank, Long Beach, John Wayne and Ontario. Van Nuys is also a noise problem airport however we are aware it is not included in the RTP discussion.</p> <p>61. Page 14, LAX Noise-Sensitive Land Use Impacts, Table 3 – The number of "Potential Person Impacts" is not included under the "1999 Official 65db Condition" column. The 1999 4* quarter LAX Noise Monitoring Report states that 78,026 people live within the LAX</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>noise impact area.</p> <p>62. The "1999 INM Condition" column states 27,986 people live within the LAX noise impact area. How could there be such a large discrepancy between the 4'h quarter report and 1999 INM?</p> <p>63. Page 24, Ontario Noise-Sensitive Land Use Impacts, Table 5 – Same comment as in Table 3. The 1999 4th quarter Ontario Noise Monitoring Report states there are 2,098 people living within the 65db CNEL contour? The 199 INM Condition says 166 people are within the contour. This again seems to be a big difference. –</p> <p>64. Page 32, Baseline Conditions - Should the official 1999 noise contour map be used in place of the 1999 INM? Isn't the official contour more accurate than the INM since it is based on monitoring data?</p> <p>65. Page 34, Noise-Sensitive Land Use Impacts, Table 7 – Should data from the 4th quarter Noise Monitoring Report for John Wayne be included in this table? According to this report the are a total of 20.78 acres and 298 people living within the 65db CNEL contour.</p> <p>66. There is also no "Official 1999 Noise Contour</p>	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE
RTP			RTP
		<p>Map for John Wayne as there is for the other airports.</p> <p>67. Page 41, Baseline Conditions - First paragraph says the 4* quarter 1998 Noise Impact Report for Burbank was used. Should it be the 1999 report?</p>	<p>1, 2, 3.</p> <p>Comments noted and SCAG acknowledges that a typographical error was made in the 1998 RTP regarding the I-710 gap closure. It has been corrected in the final RTP.</p>
City of Alhambra	Paul L. Talbot Councilman City of Alhambra 111 South First Street Alhambra, CA 91801 626/570-5010 626/281-2448	<p>1. The City of Alhambra strongly supports the inclusion of the 710 Freeway Gap Closure Project in the financially constrained RTP.</p> <p>2. There is a strong regional consensus that the 710 Freeway Gap Closure is ready to proceed to construction. To this end, SCAG, MTA and CDOT must include this essential regional transportation project in all long-range transportation plans as fully fundable.</p> <p>3. It is our understanding that the 1998 RTP contained a typographical error that has been carried into the draft 2001 RTP. In Tables 5.4 and 5.6, the 710 Freeway Gap Closure Project is listed as a committed project but the proposed completion date is 2020. It is our understanding that the proposed completion date has been and remains 2010. We request you correct this completion date error in Table 5.4 and 5.6.</p> <p>4. In the Goods Movement section of the draft 2001 RTP (p. 76), there is a discussion of the</p>	<p>4.</p> <p>The 710 Gap Closure project was adopted as one of 15 Goods Movement Advisory Committee (GMAC) unranked priorities, not listed in any specific</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>710 Freeway Gap Closure Project as a Goods Movement Investment. Please note that the federally committed mitigation of the 710 Freeway Gap Closure includes a ban on through trucks, however, local truck deliveries are permitted on the facility. Since the truck ban is a commitment of FHWA, the 710 Gap Closure should be removed from the list of "Recommended Goods Movement Investments."</p>	<p>numerical order, on December 1998. On February 24, 2000 the list of "priorities" was reduced to 14 and it was decided to consider this a list of projects, focus areas, and needed studies. The 710 gap closure remains as one of these 14. While GMAC recognizes that under present commitments the 710 gap closure would not allow through trucks, it remains on the list because it would divert some automobile traffic away from the Golden State Freeway, and alleviate some of the congestion impacting I-5 truck traffic. Note that the 710 gap closure is not listed as a goods movement project in the goods movement section of the plan, and should be considered a GMAC focus area. It is included in the introduction to this RTP section only as a statement of interest on the part of the GMAC. Also, it cannot be removed from the GMAC list, except by general consensus of the GMAC or through a majority vote of GMAC members.</p>
City of Arcadia	<p>William R. Kelley City Manager City of Arcadia 240 West Huntington Drive P. O. Box 60021 Arcadia, CA 91066 626/574-5402</p>	<p>1. The City of Arcadia is requesting that SCAG include Phase II of the Blue Line Light Rail project into the final RTP.</p> <p>2. This rail project is an extremely important element of the regional Transportation network.</p> <p>3. The Arcadia City Council has always been a proponent of this transportation project and desires your assistance in making sure it becomes a reality</p>
City of Burbank	<p>Greg Herrmann City of Burbank 275 East Olive Avenue P. O. Box 6459 Burbank, CA 91510-6459 818/238-5170</p>	<p>1. <b>Maglev System</b> – While the need for additional public transportation facilities will be increasingly important as populations grow and freeway congestion worsens, relying on the proposed Maglev system as a "magic bullet" could potentially delay implementing upgrades</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>of existing transit systems and the planning of other more feasible services. Beyond the technological questions of mechanical reliability and suitability to urban transit, the proposed “innovative public-private partnership” scheme to fund the \$16 billion Maglev project is highly speculative, relying on high ridership levels and an uncommitted Federal grant.</p> <p><b>2.</b></p> <p><b>Truck Lanes</b> – The RTP identifies the need for separate truck lanes constructed along the outside of the I-5 and SR-60 freeways, or on structures elevated above the freeways where sufficient right-of-way is not available. The projected total cost of adding two truck lanes in either direction on these freeways, using both surface and elevated configurations, is \$5.6 billion. It is estimated that the net revenues generated from the assumed tolls on these facilities would provide roughly 30 percent of the project cost; the remaining funding is expected to be provided by “local, state, and federal grants”, along with \$1.5 billion in private funding.</p> <p><b>3.</b></p>	<p>The RTP recommends studying the feasibility of an inland port for purposes of reducing truck trips associated with the movement of international goods. The RTP also supports expansion of on-dock rail facilities at the San Pedro Bay Ports and the completion of the Alameda Corridor rail project in order to move more foreign cargo through the region on rail lines. Finally, SCAG will be studying main line rail capacity between Los Angeles and the Inland Empire to determine how best to move goods and passengers in these corridors. Nevertheless, it should be noted that cargo that currently moves between the SCAG region and beyond the Rocky Mountains (which is the great majority of port-related intermodal cargo) already moves by rail. Most of the area's domestic goods move between Los Angeles County and other parts of the SCAG region, and thus would not be amenable to rail handling.</p> <p>As with the Maglev recommendation, SCAG appears to be relying on a very speculative programs, both in terms of cost and feasibility, to meet its mobility mandates and goals. The estimated costs of the truck lanes are based solely on right-of-way studies that indicate whether the lanes can be constructed alongside the freeways, or whether they must be elevated to minimize impacts to adjacent land uses. Only</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>cursory analysis has been conducted to determine the costs and impacts associated with obtaining additional right-of-way where it is marginally less expensive to do so than construct elevated lanes. Also, only minimal design work has been done to determine the feasibility and cost of providing access to adjacent arterial streets, and of constructing interchanges with other freeways. Moreover, the potential aesthetic and sound impacts of elevated truck lanes in freeway-adjacent communities have not been adequately considered. As an alternative to the truck lanes, it may be more cost-effective to improve the rail facilities to provide the capacity to ship the majority of the cargo in consolidation centers outside of the urban area, where trucks would load it for transport to outlying areas.</p>	<p><b>4.5</b> SCAG acknowledges the difficulties associated with the proposed funding strategy. However, SCAG believes revenue sources identified in the RTP are reasonably available sources. SCAG is proposing to maintain revenue sources that may otherwise be lost in the coming years.</p> <p><b>4. Funding the RTP</b> – SCAG recommends adopting an “alternative funding strategy” to provide the \$40.1 million needed to offset the identified \$10.7 million shortfall and the \$29.4 million needed for additional transportation improvements. As stated in the RTP, Federal policies (with which SCAG must comply) require the use of funding sources that are “reasonably expected to be available”, and that “proposed new revenues and/or revenue sources to cover shortfalls shall be identified, including strategies for insuring their availability for proposed investments.” The funding strategy proposed by SCAG relies upon: the continuations of local sales tax measures for transportation in the four SCAG counties (other</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>than LA) that have programs that will expire within the next 10 years, and a new sales tax program in the sixth; continued general fund appropriations from the state sales tax on gasoline (continuing the Governor's transportation funding program beyond 2006); implementation of a new revenue raising mechanism on alternative fuel vehicles; and an adjustment to the current state excise fuel tax rate.</p> <p>5. With recent attempts to establish a less than two-thirds vote process for extending and/or imposing local sales taxes having failed, the availability of the additional \$7.86 billion projected to be generated by this source is questionable. While the implementation of a new tax on alternative fuel vehicles and an adjustment to the current state excise fuel tax rate are reasonable sources to pursue, even small incremental tax increases are often difficult to implement. The SCAG funding plan includes an additional \$6 billion in revenue that is contingent upon the Governor's Transportation Funding Program being extended past 2006. The \$7 billion that was originally made available last year through this program is primarily due to the recent soundness of the state's economy and the resulting surpluses. Given the cyclical nature of economic patterns, and shifting budget priorities, this source of funding should not be relied upon to fund transportation needs past the stated 2006 cut-off.</p> <p>6.</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p><b>Air Quality –</b> The City has some very serious concerns with the aviation scenarios and recommendations contained in the RTP and EIR.</p> <p>1. While the City of Chino Hills generally supports the programs contained within the RTP, we believe that it is important for SCAG to critically evaluate the growth forecasts for the region as a whole and to ensure that the transportation system will be upgraded as appropriate in the most cost-efficient manner.</p> <p>2. The City of Chino Hills continues to be concerned that there is a need for the region to focus on ensuring that additional growth does not further exacerbate the existing congestion and air quality problems or perpetuate the jobs/housing imbalances. The RTP should be expanded.</p> <p>3. To identify a process for increasing cooperation between County Transportation Commissions on developing financing plans and priority lists for critical regional transportation system improvements.</p> <p>4. To indicate SCAG's commitment to continuing to sponsor the Four Corners Transportation Policy Coordination Group; and,</p> <p>5.</p>	<p>Comment noted. See response to Letter L1 in Response to Comments, Final PEIR Addendum, April 2001.</p> <p>1. Comment noted. The purpose of the RTP is to plan for future transportation needs, given future projections in population and employment growth and the need to meet air quality conformity goals. Furthermore, one of the performance indicators used in evaluating the plan is cost-effectiveness.</p> <p>2, 3 Comment noted. Throughout the development of the 2001 RTP, SCAG has worked with the County Transportation Commissions to address finance and inter-regional issues. This is certainly an ongoing process that SCAG is fully committed to.</p> <p>4-7. The recommendations from the Four Corners study have been given due consideration in the development of the RTP. The challenges of future population and employment growth and their effect on traffic congestion, transportation investment choices, air quality and housing needs are significant long-range planning issues. In response, SCAG has</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>To publicize the significant progress made by the Group during the past two years culminating with publication of the Four Corners Study in June of 2000.</p> <p>6. We would ask that SCAG actively work with the Group in implementing the recommended improvement strategies for the Four Corners area.</p> <p>7. We are seeking SCAG's continued commitment to the Group and to working in partnership with the public agencies involved to secure funding for all of the strategies and to develop detailed multi-agency financing plans to ensure implementation.</p>	<p>created the Growth Visioning Subcommittee to inform, engage and facilitate consensus on a "Vision" - a strategy for addressing the challenging consequences of anticipated growth in the region. Specifically, this Subcommittee will provide a policy framework for growth forecasts; provide direction on producing alternative urban form scenarios; consider balanced and efficient growth and transportation patterns; and consider other sustainable development and environmental issues.</p> <p>1. Based on SCAG's growth forecasts, western San Bernardino County and the City of Claremont respectively, are anticipated to grow. Implementation of the 2001 RTP Update is anticipated to assist in alleviating congestion and reducing criteria pollutant emissions within the region. However, project specific impacts or impacts to individual cities from proposed projects contained within the 2001 RTP Update would need to be analyzed in project-specific EIRs.</p> <p>2. Proposed Maglev Project. Claremont opposes Maglev – reasons listed in letter.</p> <p>3. Lack of planned surface transportation improvements to increase access to Ontario Airport.</p> <p>The Draft RTP project list (Technical Appendix K) includes arterial and highway improvements in San Bernardino County that address surface transportation around Ontario Airport. These include improvements to I-10 and</p>
City of Claremont	Hon. Karen M. Rosenthal City of Claremont 207 Harvard Avenue P. O. Box 880 Claremont, CA 91711 909/399-5444 <a href="http://www.ci.claremont.ca.us">www.ci.claremont.ca.us</a>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
City of Culver City	Marsh Rood Westside Cities Subregion City of Culver City 9770 Culver Boulevard P. O. Box 507 Culver City, CA 90232-0507 310/253-5700 310/253-5779 <a href="mailto:Marsha.Rood@ci.culver-city.ca.us">Marsha.Rood@ci.culver-city.ca.us</a>	<p>4. Implications of long-range corridor designation not addressed in Draft RTP.</p> <p>1. Comment noted. Improving transportation mobility for all people is one of the regional goals of the RTP. SCAG is committed to working towards this goal.</p> <p>The area is served by the region's two busiest freeways (the I-10 and I-405), some of the most congested arterials, and transit lines with some of the highest ridership. Exhibits 4.3 and 4.6 of the Draft RTP illustrate that the Westside will continue to density with high levels of population and employment growth forecasted for the Westside. The 2001 RTP must do a better job of addressing the fact that urbanized transportation facilities and services are reaching capacity and additional measures are needed.</p> <p><b>Additional Realistic Sources of Funding for Transportation Must be Identified</b></p> <p>2. The Westside Cities Subregion acknowledges the regional need to address the funding shortfall and supports the inclusion of the Alternative Funding Strategies in the Draft RTP. We question the viability of the Innovative Funding Strategies, however, and the feasibility of the maglev system in particular which they are proposed to finance.</p> <p>3. We support the consideration of new revenue</p> <p>I-15, and arterial improvements on Holt Blvd. and Airport Drive.</p> <p>4. The Draft RTP explains that the identification of long-range corridors is the first step in planning for future transportation needs. This process will involve intergovernmental coordination, in which local governments will play an integral part.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>sources that create incentives for transit use, ridesharing, clean fuel vehicles and shorter commutes, but question their use for such capital-intensive projects as truck lanes. The Cities will also encourage and support legislation to adjust the current north-south split in state gasoline tax revenues to more accurately reflect the origin of revenues generated.</p> <p><b>Transit Services and Livable Communities Should be the First Priorities for Allocation of These New Funds</b></p>	<p>4. Comment noted. Refer to Technical Appendix F.</p> <p>4. It is unclear from the Finance Chapter how the funds are proposed to be distributed by mode. Figure 6.2 indicates that 59% of the Baseline costs are for transit projects and 41% for roadway projects. Comparable data is not provided for the Draft Plan. A greater share of the regional checkbook should be devoted to public transit and public transit facilities in urbanized areas. Increased transit service should be the first priority for expenditure of new funding sources. Improved transit stops, including comfortable waiting areas and good lighting will facilitate ridership.</p> <p>5. a. Comment noted. SCAG fully supports ITS, and ITS is an integral component of the 2001 RTP.</p> <p>b. Comment noted. Upward adjustments have been made to the proposed investment in non-motorized transportation.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>efficiency from past road construction investments, while at the same time ensuring that our communities remain livable. The cities have no room for additional roadway widenings and would not want to sacrifice needed parking and sidewalk space to gain additional travel lanes. Non-motorized modes of transportation are a viable means of mobility in an urbanized area and are essential to the success of the transit systems. Page 95 of the Draft Plan indicates that currently 1.5-2% of total work trips are made by non-motorized means and suggests that this could increase to 5% even without coordinated planning with other modes, and more if such coordinated planning were funded. This would be a significant mode shift worthy of more investment than the \$450 Million (1.5% of the plan spending) proposed. Funding to develop and enhance bicycle facilities and attractive, convenient pedestrian paths should be eligible from roadway funding sources and a priority for any new revenue sources.</p> <p>6. Park-And-Ride Lots and Transportation Demand Management are also important. The Westside Cities Subregion supports the principle of strengthening Rule 2202 to encourage ridesharing. We also support the need for park-and-ride lots throughout the region, HOV lanes on all freeways, and remote park-and-ride points for major airports, such as the LAX Flyaway service that once existed near the San Diego Freeway on federal property.</p> <p><b>High Capacity Transportation Options</b></p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>7. HOV lanes should be included on the San Diego Freeway (I-405) to complete the gap in the programmed HOV lane system. The northbound HOV lane from I-10 to the US-101 should be included. We do not support the addition of mixed flow lanes, at the exclusion of HOV lanes, as shown on Exhibit 5.5 and Table 5.6. Similarly, HOV lanes should be added to the Santa Monica Freeway (I-10) in both directions from the Harbor Freeway (I-110) to Lincoln Boulevard in Santa Monica. We concur with the inclusion of a stand-alone project on the Exposition Boulevard transit corridor as a Baseline Transit Corridor (Table 5.11). It represents a valuable resource that could add significant travel capacity to the western part of the County. There are many opinions about how to use the right-of-way, but there is no question that it has significant ridership potential. A transit project along this corridor does require sensitivity to adjacent residences, cross traffic, and other issues, but the Westside Cities encourage that these issues be adequately addressed so that a decision can be made and a project can be implemented. The decision making about this corridor should be accelerated so that implementation could occur prior to 2010.</p> <p>8. In the past, the Westside Cities have all adopted formal positions supporting an extension of the</p>	<p>Should be Included in the 2001 RTP for the Westside.</p>	<p>7, 8 A northbound HOV lane on the I-405 from the I-10 to the US-101 is included in the baseline. The completion of the HOV system will be an important step towards meeting future travel demand.</p> <p>The Final 2001 RTP will include four transit corridors that will serve the Westside cities, one of which is a busway on Wilshire. The Rapid Bus demonstration line on Wilshire has shown great ridership potential and SCAG is concurring with the LACMTA plan to invest in this corridor. In addition to this corridor that serves the Westside, SCAG is proposing, as in the 1998 RTP, a light rail/busway project for the Exposition corridor.</p> <p>The Green Line extension to LAX is assumed, as in the 1998 RTP, to be privately funded.</p> <p>The projects that are in the baseline are only those that are either in the Regional Transportation Implementation Plan (RTIP) or in the Governor's Plan. The two Rapid Bus lines that will be in the baseline are Wilshire Blvd. (Rapid Bus/Busway) and Ventura Blvd. Tables 5.11 and 5.12 have been updated to include several new Rapid Bus corridors submitted recently by LACMTA.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
COMMENTS		
	<p>Red Line west to the San Diego Freeway.</p> <p>Studies have consistently shown that ridership potential on Westside corridors, such as the Wilshire corridor, is dramatically higher than other candidate corridors. The RTP should acknowledge this ridership potential. In spite of the ballot measure that precludes use of local sales tax for subway construction, the RTP should include the Red Line extension as a conceptual post-2020 corridor in Chapter 8, which currently focuses on primarily on outlying highway corridors. Tables 5.11, 5.12 and Exhibit 5.6 raise several questions that need to be clarified in the Final RTP:</p> <p>(1)---Is the Green Line Extension to LAX to be funded by the Plan or by the airport, as assumed by the MTA in its Long Range Plan?</p> <p>(2)---The text indicates that the first eight corridors in Table 5.12 are included in the MTA Phase II Metro Rapid Bus Program. Should these be part of the Baseline corridors in Table 5.11? [Note: check project limits in Table 5.12].</p> <p><b>Improvements to LAX Must Carefully Consider the Surrounding Local Transportation Context.</b></p>	<p>9. Comment noted.</p> <p>As plans for the expansion of this regionally significant airport unfold, careful consideration must be given to appropriate road and transit connections to the Westside transportation</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>System within a livable communities context.</p> <p>Local priorities for a livable communities approach to transportation planning should be reflected in LAX access plans and the airport's connections with rail and port facilities.</p> <p>Expansion options must also address the system implications from pressure to divert general aviation flights from LAX to other local airports, such as Santa Monica Airport.</p>	<p>10. The Draft RTP contains an "Action" (page 90) to "Mitigate the effects of expanding airports and consider the reuse of military bases so that community impacts are minimized." There are no specific proposals for how this "Action" will be accomplished. We also feel that this "Action" should be expanded to address impacts to local airports and their surrounding communities. It is unclear from the Aviation section how the impacts of LAX expansion to 70 Million Annual Passengers (MAP) or 103 MAP could be mitigated. It is also unclear what happens to the aviation system demand in those scenarios where the demand is constrained to less than the 172 MAP unconstrained regional demand. Does it shift air passengers to another region, and if so, is that a negative impact to the region if through passengers on airplanes make connections elsewhere in the country, or does it shift air passengers to auto drivers, which would have negative impacts on the region?</p> <p>11. The Implications of the "Black Box" and Potential Future Non-Conformity Should be</p> <p>SCAG analyzed a number of scenarios detailing what would be the passenger and air cargo demand at regional airports including assumptions such as if LAX were or were not to expand; El Toro is built or not; and, market incentives and high speed rail were used to increase demand at Palmdale and new airports in the Inland Empire. SCAG also looked at the regional environmental impacts of each scenario in the RTP PEIR including congestion and air quality. Environmental justice is addressed in the RTP.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>Raised to the Attention of All Policy Makers Region-Wide</p> <p>12. The ability of new technologies to meet the Clean emissions targets established under the Clean Air Act is a major uncertainty. These unknown technologies have been used as a "quick fix" in preparing past conforming RTPs. The Conformity Analysis in the Draft RTP does not mention the "black box" used to reach conformity, nor does it explain the implications of non-conformity. This issue must be raised to the awareness of policy makers so they may begin to assess the implications of non-conformity and/or changes in the requirements of the Clean Air Act.</p> <p>13. More Realistic Growth Forecasts Reflecting the Inability to Commute Long Distances Should be Included in the Planning Process.</p> <p>14. We understood that SCAG intended to model the implications of alternative growth scenarios, including scenarios that incorporate Transit Oriented Development (more density around transit stations) and a more balanced distribution of jobs and housing to minimize travel demand. We do not see the results of any such analysis in the Draft RTP.</p> <p>15. SCAG's trend-based forecasts indicate that people will move farther away from the .....</p>	<p>Comments noted and revisions have been made accordingly.</p> <p>12. Comments noted and revisions have been made accordingly.</p> <p>13, 14, 15 The challenges of future population and employment growth and their effect on traffic congestion, transportation investment choices, air quality and housing needs are significant long-range planning issues. In response, SCAG has created the Growth Visioning Subcommittee to inform, engage and facilitate consensus on a "Vision" - a strategy for addressing the challenging consequences of anticipated growth in the region. Specifically, this Subcommittee will provide a policy framework for growth forecasts; provide direction on producing alternative urban form scenarios; consider balanced and efficient growth and transportation patterns; and consider other sustainable development and environmental issues.</p> <p>The efforts of this Subcommittee will not necessarily affect the growth forecast adopted for the 2001 RTP Update. Rather, during the next two years, this Subcommittee will work with the subregions and other relevant stakeholders to develop alternative growth scenarios to accommodate projected growth. These scenarios may guide future growth forecasts in a manner that recognizes the impacts of the location of projected employment and population growth and changing demographics on land use patterns, transportation facilities, and the .....</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>urbanized employment areas and commute hours in each direction to/from work. Such growth patterns are counter-productive to the best use of resources (land and other infrastructure, and transportation). The Final RTP should include transportation and land use policies that will begin to reverse these trends. The Land Use – Transportation section (page 97) begins to address some of these issues, but we feel that it does not go far enough in recommending some of the strategies discussed. The “Action” (page 101) to “Support scheduled service vanpools and jitney services that link activity centers” should be supported with additional financial resources. Exhibit 5.10 dramatically illustrates how many of the activity centers are located in the Westside Cities Subregion. On page 71, the Draft RTP notes that third tier transit could increase transit ridership by 20%.</p> <p><b>What Does it Mean for the Westside?</b></p> <p>16.</p> <p>We feel that one of the biggest shortcomings of the Draft RTP is the Plan Performance chapter. It is impossible to ascertain what the plan means to the Westside Cities Subregion. There are no graphics illustrating the levels of congestion on the freeway or arterial system. The mobility indicators show slower speeds and more delay in 2025, than the Goal or Base Year, but we cannot tell if it is significantly worse in our subregion or marginally better as a result of the RTP. There is also no data provided as to the overall transit mode split or ridership on some of the environment and open space. Examples of these scenarios might include promoting growth in a number of activity centers and along growth corridors, focusing growth in pedestrian-friendly, transit accessible communities, and achieving a better regional jobs-housing balance.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Figure 5.1, page 46, graphically illustrates 1997 Base Year Freeway Congestion. Figure 5.11, page 104, graphically illustrates 2025 Draft Plan Freeway Congestion.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>17. Many of the comments in this letter represent a reiteration of comments that the Westside Cities Subregion submitted in October, 2000 on the <i>Discussion Document</i>, and on the Regional Transportation Plan (98 RTP). The Westside Cities feel that the policies and spending priorities of the 98 RTP were inadequate to meet the transportation challenges in the urbanized areas of the region in general, and the Westside Cities Subregion in particular. The 98 Plan's funding priorities were heavily concentrated in actions which provide for more efficient truck movement and which ease the long-distance commute needs of those who have chosen to reside in outlying areas of the region. The 98 RTP did not, in our subregion's view, properly balance the scale of regional transportation needs. We also respectfully disagree with the statement in the Executive Summary of the current Draft RTP (page 10) that "the plan is responsive to the need to protect and improve the environment and to ensure that all of the region's residents and businesses have access to a transportation system that serves their respective needs."</p> <p>18. In closing, we would like to quote from the <i>Discussion Document</i> (page 26), "It is not an exaggeration to say that transit is the single most important component determining the success or failure of the RTP. No other component by</p>	<p>17. Comment noted.</p> <p>18. Comment noted.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>itself can do as much to reduce VMT and meet transportation conformity.” We would like to reiterate that transit and livable communities strategies are the most applicable and most deserving of funding in the urbanized areas of the region, where the majority of the jobs are located and the majority of the people live. We think the Plan should be more aggressive in its goals – rather than merely striving to maintain the 1997 per capita ridership of 34.9 annual transit trips per person, the Plan should strive to improve the transit mode share.</p>	<p>1, 2 The proposed truck lane Report on SR-60 does not specify San Jose Creek as a potential alternative. The Regional Council of SCAG indicated that all feasible alternatives should be evaluated.</p>
City of Diamond Bar	<p>Mr. James DeStefano Interim City Manager City of Diamond Bar 21660 E. Copley Drive, Ste. 100 Diamond Bar, CA 81765- 4177 909/396-5666 909/860-2489 909/861-3117 – fax <a href="http://www.CityofDiamondBar.com">www.CityofDiamondBar.com</a> (rec'd via fax from Colin Lennard's office)</p>	<p>1. The use of the San Jose Creek wash as an alternative to adding truck lanes on the State Route 60 Freeway, was initiated without communicating with the affected cities of Diamond Bar, Industry, or Walnut and would result in significant adverse impacts on the quality of life for those residents through issues related to noise, disruption and safety.</p> <p>2. Due to the many negative impacts associated with the project, as well as, the dangerous precedent which it would establish, we are requesting that you reject the TCC's decision to include the San Jose Creek wash project into the RTP.</p>
City of El Segundo	<p>Denny Zane Urban Dimension City of El Segundo Shute, Mihaly &amp; Weinberger LLP</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>The attached report prepared by Denny Zane: Urban Dimensions is submitted on behalf of the City of El Segundo and constitutes the comments of the City on the Draft 2001 RTP</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>396 Hayes Street San Francisco, California 94102 Telephone (415) 552-7272 Facsimile (415) 552-5816 <a href="http://www.SMWLAW.COM">www.SMWLAW.COM</a></p>	<p>Update, the Draft EIR on the RTP Update, and the document separately released by SCAG last month entitled "Towards an Optimized Aviation Scenario."</p> <p>As pointed out in the comments themselves, the release of the latter document during the public comment period on the DEIR without completion of a supplemental EIR or inclusion of the new information in the DEIR itself appears calculated to deprive the public of an opportunity to comment, and violates CEQA.</p> <p>2. The Draft RTP indicates on page 5 that the 1998 RTP Medium Aviation Scenario is used as a placeholder in the Draft RTP pending review of the RTP EIR and the selection of the preferred aviation alternative. It is understood, therefore, that the '98 RTP Medium Aviation Scenario was used in assessing the Plan's performance on issues of a general nature such as mobility and accessibility, the overall air quality performance and the transportation conformity analysis of the Draft RTP, and environmental justice issues. Once a preferred aviation scenario is selected then it may or may not be necessary to assess the Plan's performance in light of the changes represented by that scenario. (Draft RTP, page 5)</p> <p>At the direction of the Transportation and Communications Committee (TCC) SCAG presented a hybrid scenario that combined elements of other scenarios ("Towards an Optimized Aviation Scenario"). The information presented on the hybrid ("Decentralized") scenario was presented for informational purposes only to the TCC. The evaluation of impacts of that scenario are based on the analyses of the scenarios presented in the 2001 RTP PEIR. The Decentralized Scenario falls within the range of scenarios analyzed in the 2001 RTP PEIR. The analysis and information presented does not constitute significant new information and therefore does not require recirculation of the Draft PEIR nor does it necessitate the preparation of a supplemental document under CEQA.</p> <p>2. The EIR evaluates all impacts as compared to existing (or in some cases 1997 as a reasonable approximation) conditions. Impacts of cumulative conditions are identified by comparing 1997 to future No Project Conditions. RTP impacts (i.e., the highway, transit, goods movement, and components) are evaluated by comparing the 2001 RTP to No Project conditions (holding the Aviation Scenario - RTP Medium-constant). Then the differences in impacts of the aviation scenarios are compared to the RTP Medium aviation scenario.</p> <p>In the alternatives section of the RTP PEIR the No Project and 1998 RTP Alternative are evaluated for all aviation scenarios, although generally at a lesser level of detail than the 2001 RTP. The RTP Medium Aviation Scenario is used as the quantitative basis of comparison between alternatives and scenarios; however, all scenarios are analyzed. Any one of the Aviation Scenarios may occur under any RTP condition or even the No Project condition because the aviation scenarios will occur independent of the RTP. See Response to Letter L5 in Response to Comments, Final PEIR Addendum, April 2001.</p> <p>3.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>We agree that, in order to implement an adopted Regional Aviation Plan new institutional arrangements may be needed, such as a regional airport authority. The recently revived Southern California Regional Airport Authority <u>may</u> or <u>may not</u> be the appropriate entity responsible for overseeing such regional airport development and the RTP correctly avoids presuming that it is. (Draft RTP, page 5)</p> <p>4. Unlike the 1998 RTP, which set aside \$1 billion in regional arterial funds for ground access improvements for airports, the Draft RTP makes scant reference to the costs or financing mechanisms for ground access improvements for each of the Aviation Scenarios. This is a significant omission and makes it entirely unclear what the financial burdens to the region are with respect to each aviation scenario, or each airport. (Draft RTP, page 10).</p> <p>5. Propose for an additional Regional Goal: Assure a fair and equitable distribution of both the benefits of investment in transportation systems and the burdens of those systems between the counties of Southern California. (Draft RTP, page 14).</p> <p>6. Propose Revisions to Transportation policies and Objectives: (Draft RTP, page 15,16)</p> <p>Policy #5: The Regional Transportation Improvement Program (RTIP) shall be</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>4. The ground access improvements for airports continues to be addressed by the Arterials/Ground Access Improvement category primarily. In addition, transit strategies such as the extension of the Green Line into LAX also addressed ground access issues.</p> <p>5. The funding constraint requirement and limitations in funding transferability between counties and between categories would make this goal impossible to achieve.</p> <p>6. The current RTIP with partial or full construction funding is considered the baseline in the RTP. Therefore, the current RTIP would, by definition, be</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>developed using the RTP as guidance, and approval shall be based on its consistency with the RTP. The RTIP shall be revised each time the RTP is revised to assure all RTIP projects are consistent with the current RTP.</p> <p>Policy #8: (Revise to read) Commercial airport capacity shall be expanded to serve passenger and freight needs consistent with a healthy quality of life and a sustainable regional environment.</p>	<p>consistent with the RTP. It is the future RTIP amendment, post-RTP adoption, that must demonstrate consistency with the adopted RTP. Technically, the RTIP would not need revision each time the RTP is updated.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
	<p>Policy #12: Inland ports, including airports, providing facilities for cargo to enter or leave the basin shall be a priority in order to relieve congestion at existing port and airport facilities and to reduce the pressures of increasing truck traffic on an already congested freeway system. If still necessary, new freeway facilities shall be open for goods movement only where safety concerns will not be compromised.</p>	<p>With regard to inland ports, the plan calls for a study of the feasibility of a rail haul to inland seaports. Generally, rail is predominant only in the long-haul markets with a shipment length of over 800 miles and many industry experts believe that very short rail hauls are not economically feasible under most circumstances or else will require a subsidy to operate. Rail haul potential to inland ports is in fact under study now and at this point it is premature to make an assessment of feasibility for our region. But it should be noted that on major east-west freeways such as SR-60, only a small percentage of trucks are engaged in drayage moves of marine containers, even though some people have confused domestic containers and ordinary highway vans with marine containers. Even with an inland port rail shuttle, very considerable volumes of truck traffic would remain. Trucks are necessary for the movement of goods within the region, because there is very minor rail network coverage to businesses and stores across southern California, as compared to the road network. This means that short-haul shipments would require a truck dray at both ends of the trip with a short rail haul in the middle, which would impose tremendous delay and cost to goods movement.</p>
		<p>7. Observations regarding Regional Performance Indicators: (Draft RTP, page 18)</p> <p>Equity/Environmental Justice: (Revised to say) The benefit of transportation investments and</p> <p>7-8. SCAG's analysis of the benefits and burdens of the Regional Transportation plan considered all the positive and negative impacts for which reliable data was available, i.e.; SCAG's environmental justice analysis assessed both benefits and burdens associated with the RTP see Technical Appendix I.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>8. Similar concerns regarding approach to environmental justice on pages 27, 28 where there is greater emphasis placed upon distribution of benefits and opportunities with distribution of burdens less emphasized. (Draft RTP, page 27,28)</p> <p>9. Section IV. Planning Assumptions does not provide a table which shows the numerical distribution of projected population and employment growth to the counties in the SCAG Region in 2025 (or earlier years) as was provided in previous RTPs. This is a glaring omission and deprives the reader of essential information necessary for well-informed judgments about important transportation policy matters. The maps that are provided are nowhere near as useful as the quantified tables. (Draft RTP, page 29)</p> <p>10. Nowhere is there a detailed explanation of the air passenger demand or the cargo demand forecast for 2020 or 2025, which underlay the aviation scenarios and the entire system analysis. How do the physical constraints of the existing ground transportation system, for example, with respect to its ability to absorb new truck and new automobile traffic affect these forecasts? (Draft RTP, page 51)</p> <p>9. Information is provided in the Technical Appendix.</p> <p>10. For a detailed analysis of transportation impacts, please see RTP EIR Volume 1.</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>11. The MAGLEV system is described as linking primarily to regional airports in the system. Yet, there is no general description of the nature of its linkage, physically or operationally, to any of these airports. Without such a description it is impossible to judge its impact on airport operations or its contribution to overall regional mobility. (Draft RTP, page 74)</p> <p>12. The Goods Movement - Ports, Rail and Trucks section raises as many questions as it provides answers. The description of the impact on the region's freeway and arterial system is alarming. "There is almost no capacity to deal with this increase" "SCAG forecasts that by 2025, some freeways may be completely overwhelmed by trucks... which in some instances is double the capacity of existing freeways."</p> <p>13. The Draft RTP addresses the implications of this horrendous problem by proposing the development of a set of extremely expensive and otherwise quite burdensome truck lanes, either along side existing freeways, or over them as a double-decked system. The costs of such a system are estimated to be approximately \$10 billion.</p> <p>11. The RTP and its associated EIR are policy, planning and programmatic documents. Detailed evaluation of individual projects and/or locations in not called for under CEQA, nor is it feasible. The RTP is updated every three years, while a MAGLEV or Airport Master Plan may take more than three years.</p> <p>12. This is why truck lanes were recommended in the Plan for SR-60 and I-15, with studies of truck lanes on I-710 and I-5.</p> <p>13. Truck lanes are included in the RTP in order to reduce peak hour delay and unsafe traffic conditions relating to the interweaving of trucks and automobiles; to handle the growing numbers of trucks; to improve truck throughput; and to ensure continued vitality of goods movement, by moving freight with less congestion and delay. The 1998 RTP work included a benefit/cost evaluation of a number of highway corridors, and determined that the SR-60 truck lane project was the more cost-effective than an alternative mixed-flow improvement option for a 35 mile segment of the 60 Freeway; specifically, benefit/cost was 37% greater for the truck lanes as compared to the mixed-flow option, while ROG reduction was twice as great for the truck lanes as for the mixed-flow option, and vehicle delay reduction was 20% greater for the truck lanes. Evaluation of other truck lane options including truck lanes on the I-15 and I-710 indicated a very high cost-effectiveness for these projects. Notwithstanding the expense, the benefits appear to exceed the costs for truck</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>14. There is a crying need for an alternative approach to goods movement in the region.</p> <p>15. Imbedded in the discussion about alternative aviation scenarios is an alternative distribution of air cargo facilities. Presumably, if there were a major relocation of air cargo away from LAX to the Inland Empire airports of March, San Bernardino International, and Southern California Logistics, and even to the North Los Angeles County airport at Palmdale, it would have a measurable impact on the freeway system, probably relieving significant new sources of congestion. <i>Some share</i> of the cargo destined for communities outside the basin would now have avoided a truck or train trip across the basin altogether. <i>Some share</i> of the cargo headed back into the basin would be coming from the east or the north, rather than from the west or south, perhaps utilizing entirely different freeways.</p> <p>14. Comment noted. Unfortunately there are no simple answers to this problem. A number of strategies may be needed to reduce truck impacts, including, for instance, the empty marine container study which is called for in the RTP and is currently under way. This may reduce a significant percentage of short-distance marine container trips.</p> <p>15. The majority of air cargo shipped by the region's airports is produced in the heavily-populated urban core areas of Los Angeles and Orange Counties, or if imported is destined for those areas. Trucking this cargo to and from outlying airports with ample capacity to handle it would not necessarily have positive impacts on regional highway congestion. It is acknowledged that the potential ability of outlying airports to capture air cargo being trucked to and from LAX via other regions or states would have some positive impact. However, it should be noted that most cargo being trucked to LAX is done so to take advantage of the high volume of flights to multiple domestic and international destinations at LAX. It is also important to recognize that air cargo trucking comprises only a small portion (less than 5%) of total truck trips in the region, and would also comprise a small portion of the total truck trips that are forecast to use the proposed truck lanes. Also, trucks used to carry air cargo are generally smaller than the average for the region, and have less of an impact on congestion per truck.</p> <p>With regard to rail cargo, the Plan calls for a study of the potential to add new inland domestic rail-truck intermodal terminals. This would allow more of the rail cargo coming into the Inland Empire from the east, to be off-loaded at local terminals and moved a relatively short distance by truck to destination--instead of being hauled by rail from the eastern part of the country through San Bernardino, to a downtown rail yard and then trucked back again to Inland Empire destinations as at present.</p> <p>Nowhere is such an alternative approach to air cargo movement outcome discussed or analyzed in the RTP. The discussion of Inland Ports on page 85 of the RTP is promising, and very intriguing, but it is focused on Inland Ports linked to seaports by rail. It fails to reflect in any way on the potential role of the</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>realization of such an Inland Ports system. This, despite the fact that the more decentralized aviation scenarios all suggest major roles for inland Empire cargo oriented airports. Such an alternative must be evaluated for its potential to help the region avoid the horrendous burdens and costs associated with developing very expensive and perhaps unnecessary truck lanes. (Draft RTP, page 74).</p> <p>16. It is striking, in light of the above discussion, that the matrix that provides the only description of the alternative aviation scenarios <u>fails to include the cargo demand projections for each of these airports</u>. This despite the fact that at least three major facilities (March, San Bernardino International, and Southern California Logistics) have all articulated their desire to be primarily cargo servicing facilities. (Draft RTP, page 89).</p> <p>17. This same matrix indicates for Scenario 9 that its projected 2025 demand is 86 map, the same as projected for 2020. Scenario 9 is described as assuming an LAX expanded per the Mayor Riordan LAX Master Plan Improvements. Yet, SCAG presumes that such an airport would not grow after reaching the projected 86 MAP. This is not a reasonable supposition.</p> <p>This mistake could be merely ignored, were it not for the fact that SCAG staff recently released another scenario, SC3, which also assumes LAX Master Plan improvements. It also assumes that</p> <p>16. Please see Technical Appendix B for aviation information and Technical Appendix E for goods movement information.</p> <p>17. The LAX MAP capacity constraint is based upon an analysis that is documented in Technical Appendix D. More detailed documentation was presented at an airport capacity workshop requested by the Aviation Task Force that was attended by representatives from Urban Dimensions. This more detailed documentation will be included in the final PEIR.</p> <p>Runway capacity was identified as the ultimate limiting capacity factor at LAX. Updated aircraft load factors were used in this analysis, according to our consultants Citigroup Technologies. Average annual load factors were allowed to rise to as much as 74-78% for some aircraft, which equates to load factors as high as 90% for peak periods. The assumptions about load factors therefore covered a range of what is realistically feasible. It should be noted that the report "Towards an Optimized Aviation Solution" is incorrect in implying that</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>such an LAX would not grow beyond 86 MAP even in 2025. SCAG staff has said that 86 map is the capacity of LAX built out with Master Plan Improvements. However, the same document includes a discussion whereby, simply by assuming slightly higher load factors, the same LAX reaches 97 map. It seems that "capacity" for airports is quite different from what we normally mean by "capacity".</p> <p>In fact, the analyses that yield both the 86 MAP and the 97 MAP outcomes are both dependent upon very controversial load factor and fleet mix assumptions. If these assumptions are varied even slightly, the analysis will yield much higher overall activity levels at LAX.</p> <p>For example, other SCAG documents show that the 86 map projection as the capacity of the LAX with Master Plan improvements assumes a load factor of only 66% as well as fewer average passengers per aircraft than actually occurs today. Obviously, there is at least <u>33% unused capacity</u> in such a system, if we use the term "capacity" as we normally do. Modest increases in load factor and somewhat higher average numbers of passengers per aircraft (consistent with the larger aircraft we are told will use LAX in the future) and you get well over 110 map activity levels at LAX. And, its real capacity could well be more.</p> <p>The aircraft types that were assumed in the LAX capacity analysis are similar to those used for the LAX Master Plan. Aircraft assumed include very large aircraft currently being developed such as the Airbus 380. However, the assumptions used were not as aggressive as those employed by LAWA in forecasting the aircraft fleet mix, in terms of assuming that most "turboprop" commuters would be replaced by larger regional jets, that there would be fewer commuters as a percentage of the total fleet, and that larger "stretch" versions of existing aircraft would be employed. Use of these more aggressive assumptions would have produced larger capacity estimates in terms of passenger served, because of larger aircraft with larger carrying capacities assumed. However, this is an area of uncertainty since there is currently a debate in the aviation community over many issues concerning future aircraft fleets. These issues include the extent to which larger aircraft will be acquired by airlines in the future, how long it will take for airlines to amortize their investments in existing aircraft, the extent to which proposed new international noise regulations will accelerate turnover of aircraft fleets, the potential airspace impacts of introducing a large number of new regional jets, whether commuter and short-haul aircraft can be diverted to smaller satellite airports, and how many airports will be able to accommodate the very large new aircraft currently being proposed.</p>	<p>the lower load factors used in previous RADAM modeling (55-60% for air carriers) was also used for the capacity analysis. The capacity analysis used higher, updated load factors.</p> <p>18. Comment noted.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>19. Discussion about Aviation Funding acknowledges the absence of a revenue strategy to pay for ground access improvements at regional airports, presumably, including LAX. "The magnitude of these needs clearly surpasses the ability of the region to pay for them given the Regional Checkbook forecasts."</p> <p>20. The Transportation Conformity Analysis has determined, with the 98 RTP Medium as the placeholder aviation scenario, that the Draft RTP shows positive conformity findings. This is good. Since other alternative scenarios, including Scenario, have been demonstrated to have reduced emission profiles when compared to the RTP Medium, it is clear that the Draft RTP would meet conformity tests with Scenario 8 as the preferred aviation scenario in the 2001 RTP Update.</p>	<p>19. Comment noted.</p> <p>20. Comment noted.</p> <p>21-55 See Letter L10, Response to Comments, Final PEIR Addendum, April 2001, comments 21-55.</p>
City of Huntington Beach	<p>Howard Zelefsky Planning Director City of Huntington Beach 2000 Main Street Huntington Beach, CA 92648 310/536-5271 310/374-1540 – fax</p>	<p>1. By 2010 the “baby boomer” population will be reaching retirement age, leading to smaller labor force participation rates, so the population to employment ratio will increase. Employment growth is consistent with Southern California’s historical share of national job growth.</p> <p>1. Page 29 – Table 4.1 shows relatively steady growth in population for each of the five-year increments. In contrast, employment growth drops from 800,000 in the first five years to 400,000 for each successive five years from 2010 to 2025. The slower employment growth in relation to the steady population growth needs explanation.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
COMMENTS		
<p>2.</p> <p>Page 37 – Table 4.3 shows no changes in local bus service while there is a significant increase in both urban rail and Metrolink. There should be a similar increase in the local bus service to support the increase in rail service or an explanation as to why such an increase is not necessary.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Page 57 – Exhibit 5.3 shows various baseline projects of regional significance. This exhibit should be corrected to show that the various toll roads already exist in Orange County. In addition, the 57 Toll Road Extension southerly to the 405 Freeway should be deleted.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>Page 64 – All 14 smart street projects are shown in Orange County to be completed in 2010. Spreading out these projects would seem to be more realistic, and other strategic arterial improvements should be added.</p> <p>5.</p> <p>Page 68 – The discussion should acknowledge the upcoming West Orange County Transit Project Definition Study beginning next month.</p> <p>6.</p> <p>Page 96 – The statements contained in the discussion under ITS should be converted to action items to give this category equal importance to the others shown in this section.</p>	<p>2.</p> <p>SCAG coordinates with all of the transit agencies/ transportation commissions to include their future expansion service changes, etc, in SCAG's model and plan. Table 4.3 indicates network route miles in the model, but does not reflect other increases in service. SCAG realizes that there will be a need to increase this service network to serve the increase in population and most importantly, meet our regional transit per capita goal of 34.9 trips, and this need is reflected in RTP funding.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>The SR-57 Toll Road Extension to the I-405 cannot be deleted because it is in the RTIP (Regional Transportation Improvement Plan). SCAG does not have discretion to change the RTIP through the RTP process.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>SCAG and the implementing agencies (Orange County Transportation Authority, Riverside County Transportation Commission) concur that the Strategic Arterial Improvements / Smart Street Projects can be completed by the dates proposed.</p> <p>5.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>6.</p> <p>Comment noted. SCAG fully supports ITS, and ITS is an integral component of the 2001 RTP.</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
COMMENTS		
7.	<p>Page 104 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Figure 5.11 shows delay in the AM peak hour in 2025, but it is unclear what the percentages mean.</li> <li>b) This figure would be more meaningful if an exhibit was added showing AM delays in 1997.</li> <li>c) Additionally, consideration should be given to showing delays in the PM peak hours in 1997 and 2025 so it would support other information such as Table 7.1 on page 123.</li> <li>d) It would also be helpful to summarize in a table the net result of the improvements (i.e., decreased congestion) as graphically portrayed in Figures 5.4 and 5.11.</li> <li>e)</li> </ul>	<p>7.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Congestion delay in this map means the percent of time in delay.</li> <li>b) A map of AM delays in 1997 can be found on page 46.</li> <li>c) Comment noted.</li> <li>d) A table showing the net result of improvements can be found on page J-7 of the Technical Appendix.</li> </ul> <p>8.</p> <p>The final 2001 RTP financial forecast incorporates much of the cost-cutting measures assumed by local county transportation planning agencies – in particular, LACMTA. Any further efforts to reduce costs, however, are difficult. The region continues to fall short of meeting demand for transportation services. Deferred maintenance strategies would only increase this gap in the long-term.</p> <p>9.</p> <p>The preservation of long-range corridors is simply intended to identify the region's transportation needs beyond 2025. The corridors are not part of the constrained plan. Appropriate revisions to this section are reflected in the final plan.</p>
City of Laguna Beach	Paul P. Freeman Mayor City of Laguna Beach	<p>1.</p> <p>The three options which assume there will be an airport at the El Toro Marine Base are</p> <p>1,2, 3.</p> <p>Opposition to El Toro as a commercial service airport is noted. Two scenarios were run without El Toro to test the impacts on other existing and potential new</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>505 Forest Avenue Laguna Beach, CA 92651 949/497-3311 949/497-0771 – fax</p> <p>unacceptable to our community.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>The additional traffic, noise, air pollution and other adverse environmental consequences associated with the proposed airport are clearly inimical to the City of Laguna Beach.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>We urge you to modify the draft so that the preferred alternative does not include a new airport at El Toro.</p>	<p>airports. However, Orange County currently is, and is forecast to remain (without El Toro) the area of the region that has the greatest shortfall in available airport capacity in terms of meeting local personal and business air travel needs.</p> <p>1.</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Comments noted</p> <p>3-6.</p> <p>SCAG data are derived from over 60,000 air passenger surveys taken at all six air carrier airports in the region as well as at Lindbergh Field in San Diego,</p>
<p>City of Lake Forest</p> <p>Javier Peraza City of Lake Forest Community Development Department Planning Division 23161 Lake Center Drive Lake Forest, CA 92630 949/461-3498 949/461-3512 – fax</p>	<p>Javier Peraza City of Lake Forest Community Development Department Planning Division 23161 Lake Center Drive Lake Forest, CA 92630 949/461-3498 949/461-3512 – fax</p>	<p>Scenario Nine – The City supports this scenario as it is in agreement with the quality of life issues that are paramount, and which meet the needs, of the South Orange County Region.</p> <p><b>Guiding Principles</b></p> <p>1.</p> <p>The City of Lake Forest is fortunate to be situated in the South Orange County region, which has in the past, and is currently experiencing a healthy and thriving economy and quality of life. It is this basic understanding that might be the root of the region's reasoning to forfeit the reuse of the El Toro Marine Corps Air Station as a commercial airport. In reviewing the draft RTP, it should be noted that the data presented supports this decision.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>The City of Lake Forest is fortunate to be situated in the South Orange County region, which has in the past, and is currently experiencing a healthy and thriving economy and quality of life. It is this basic understanding that might be the root of the region's reasoning to forfeit the reuse of the El Toro Marine Corps Air Station as a commercial airport. In reviewing the draft RTP, it should be noted that the data presented supports this decision.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>This issue might be best addressed by the outlying airports and air bases that have the</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>potential to benefit the most from such endeavors. It is possible that they may not only alleviate the constraints on the local quality of life at existing airports, but they may also address environmental justice issues with the economic benefits that come with a commercial airport.</p> <p>4. Once again, this may be most beneficial to the regional areas experiencing growth and development. These outlying airports and air bases may potentially gain much more than the already thriving economies in the South Orange County region.</p> <p>5. In Appendix B- Aviation, reference is made to the fact that Orange County has previously closed Meadowlark airport in 1989 and has experienced a 16% decline in operations between 1993 and 1997. In addition, based aircraft declined by 39% between 1984 and 1993 and 6% between 1993 and 1997. From these figures it is evident that Orange County is meeting its obligation and traffic needs.</p>	<p>indicated that Orange County currently generates about 16 MAP of origin-destination (O&amp;D) demand (18.41% of the regional total, not including San Diego). The 16 MAP includes visitors, business travelers and tourists to Orange County. John Wayne currently serves about 44% of that demand: Assuming John Wayne reaches the estimated capacity of 8.4 MAP and with no El Toro, this percentage would drop to 33.2% since county O&amp;D demand is forecast to reach 25.3 MAP by 2025 (18.38% of the regional total). This forecast incorporates a very conservative 2.3% annual growth rate (from 1990 to 1999, total regional passenger travel grew at an average annual rate of 4.3%). By 2025, international passengers are forecast to make up about 51.7% of total O&amp;D passenger growth generated by Orange County. About 52.7% of the local demand would be served by El Toro while the rest would be served by LAX and Ontario.</p> <p>While El Toro would draw some passengers from other counties, including San Diego, it is important to recognize that Orange County travelers would continue to use airports outside of the county. Orange County's calculated "Fair Share" of 30.2 MAP includes connecting passengers (different from O&amp;D) which presently occur at LAX.</p> <p>Please see RADAM methodology in the RTP DEIR, Volume 3, Technical Appendix D for further information on how the model determined demand at each airport.</p> <p>6. Based on the aforementioned statistics cited in Appendix B, it seems that Orange County should not have a significant problem accommodating the projected increase in operations of 3% and 1% for based aircraft in its existing airports.</p> <p>7. 7, 8,</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>The City of Lake Forest in particular, and Orange County in general, should experience only a minimal problem in accommodating the projected community impacts. Therefore, the simple expansion of existing airports may very well be a viable solution to avoid the reuse of the El Toro Marine Corps Air Station as a commercial airport.</p> <p>8. This action should be given more consideration by SCAG as it has the greatest potential for economic development, aviation decentralization and environmental justice. For example, the airports in Palmdale and the Inland Empire could advance their developing economies, alleviate the air traffic experience at the built-out airports, and may address environmental justice issues by creating prosperity in disadvantaged neighborhoods.</p> <p><b>Project List – Appendix K</b></p> <p>9. The City of Lake Forest is concerned with the Baseline Projects for Local Highways that are listed in Appendix K, as they have the potential for significant impacts to the City. These projects include numbers ORA37101 – El Toro Road widening, ORA37164 – El Toro Road intersection improvement at Rockfield, and ORA55250 – Alton Parkway extension to the Foothill Corridor. We would like to request that the City be the lead since these projects are within our jurisdiction and we have been incorporated since December 20, 1991.</p>	<p>New airports proposed in Riverside and San Bernardino counties were assumed to be unconstrained, with the exception of Ontario Airport which was assumed to add another runway to be able to accommodate more than 20 million air passengers (MAP) a year. A variety of market incentives were assumed in the modeling process to allocate as much air travel demand to outlying airports as possible. The 2001 RTP PEIR and the RTP environmental justice technical appendix programmatically evaluate the impacts of expanding existing airports and reuse of military air bases, and the PEIR identifies mitigation measures as appropriate and feasible.</p> <p>9. Your request may involve RTIP amendment. The RTP is not a vehicle for RTIP amendment. If appropriate, your city is encouraged to initiate appropriate RTIP amendment request through OCTA.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>10.</p> <p>It is the City's request that the aforementioned issues be fully analyzed in order to attain a final RTP that is suitable for all those impacted. As stated in the draft RTP, while some projects can move very quickly from an idea to implementation, regionally significant strategies and programs require a more in depth study and analysis.</p>	<p>10.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
City of Lancaster	<p>James C. Gilley City Manager City of Lancaster 44933 North Fern Avenue Lancaster, CA 93534-2461 661/723-6000 805/723-6141 – fax</p>	<p>1. In Appendix K (Project Lists), the State Route 14/Avenue I Interchange Improvement Project has been omitted from the Local Highways Baseline Projects for Los Angeles County (Page K-98). This project has previously been submitted to SCAG for inclusion in the RTP (correspondence from Tom Horne to Naresh Amatya dated 12/17/00). Additionally, this project has already been included in the FY 2000-2001 RTP (Amendment #) by the LACMTA.</p> <p>2. The City of Lancaster and County of Los Angeles are currently working to secure federal funding for an extension of the existing runway at General William J. Fox Field. The project will help continue the job creation progress already underway in the Fox Field Industrial Corridor (FFIC) area of the City. When completed, the FFIC is expected to add 18,700 new jobs to north LA County, thereby reducing regional congestion by removing long distance commuters from the highway and arterial</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>3. The MTA, cities of Lancaster, Palmdale and Santa Clarita, LA County and Caltrans are currently beginning a Major Investment Study (MIS) for improvements to I-5, SR-14 and SR-138 in north LA County. It is anticipated that several projects will be identified for implementation along these gateway corridors. This North LA County MIS should be reflected in the RTP.</p> <p>4. Many of the maps in the RTP exhibits only include Santa Clarita and Palmdale in North LA County. The City of Lancaster should also be included so that all three North LA County cities are properly referenced. Additionally, Exhibits 4.4, 4.5 and 4.6 show employment density centers in the Lancaster area as being east of SR14. These centers should be shown as being west of SR14.</p> <p>5. Exhibit 8.1 depicts the Antelope Valley portion of the High Desert Corridor using two different mapping patterns, only one of which appears in the map legend. All segments of the High desert Corridor should be depicted using the same mapping pattern.</p> <p>3. Comment noted. The Draft RTP identifies the High Desert Corridor as a corridor for further study.</p> <p>4. Due to the scale of the maps, we cannot show the names of all cities in the SCAG region. The identification of Palmdale on the maps and not Lancaster does not reflect an intentional omission of Lancaster. Exhibits 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 showing employment density are based on SCAG's employment forecast. The numbers are empirically forecasted, in part based on local input.</p> <p>5. The High Desert Corridor is now depicted correctly on Exhibit 5.5 of the Final RTP. It remains in Exhibit 8.1 for additional study.</p>		

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>City of Long Beach Edward K. Shikada Acting Director of Public Works City of Long Beach 333 West Ocean Boulevard Long Beach, CA 90802 562/570-6383 562/570-6012 – fax</p> <p><b>1. Operations and Maintenance of Streets and Roads</b> – The City of Long Beach is supportive of increased funding for the operations and maintenance of local streets and roads. Presently funding to maintain local arterials is inadequate. While the RTP identifies increased funding for operations and maintenance, it does not specify how much will be applied to local streets and roads vs. transit and freeways. This should be clarified. The operations and maintenance of local streets and roads impacts overall mobility of all forms of transportation, including transit and goods movement, and investment in this important area should be clearly identified and increased.</p> <p><b>2. Regional Airport System and the Long Beach Airport</b> – The RTP considers several different airport operational and growth scenarios in order to meet the projected 2025 demand. The City of Long Beach is generally supportive of airport growth proposals in areas where such service is currently minimal or does not exist, and where broad community support exists.</p> <p>Proposed investment levels are outlined in the project list section of the 2001 RTP Technical Appendix. The RTP provides information concerning transit, highway, and major arterial investments. The RTP does not include funding for local streets and arterials.</p> <p>Comments noted concerning reasonable capacity enhancements and adequate mitigation measures. SCAG's PEIR for the RTP analyzed regional environmental and transportation impacts of several regional aviation alternatives. While SCAG has no authority over airport funding, all surface transportation projects must be part of a fiscally constrained regional planning process, via the RTP and RTIP. The environmental impacts of specific projects, e.g. LAX expansion, would be analyzed in a project-specific EIR or EIS.</p> <p>Long Beach Airport's legally constrained levels are reasonably represented in all scenarios, at 3 MAP.</p> <p>LAX capacity assumptions vary in the alternative scenarios. While recognizing the need for some level of expansion, the City of Long Beach is largely neutral regarding these alternatives with the caveats</p>	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  <b>SCAG RESPONSE</b> RTP
		<p>that – 1) additional air transportation capacity will be needed in the region and as such, reasonable capacity enhancement efforts should be encouraged, 2) where capacity and growth is envisioned, adequate mitigation measures should be implemented to address environmental quality considerations (at LAX and any/all other airports in the RTP), and 3) off-airport infrastructure investment requisite to significant airport capacity enhancement needs to be viewed in the context of total regional infrastructure needs, so that airport solutions don't create major resource allocation shortfalls in other areas of public infrastructure need.</p> <p><b>3. I-710 Improvements resulting from Major Corridor Study</b> – Funding for improvements on the I-710 between SR60 and the Port of Long Beach, which will result from the Major Corridor Study currently underway, should be identified. The I-710 MCS is a two-year study that will conclude with specific recommendations for investments within the next two years, so funding should be identified for priority projects and improvements that will likely extend beyond truck lanes. No funding is identified in either Table 5.4 and 5.6. The I-710 between SR60 and the Port of Long Beach should also be added to the list of non-prioritized projects identified by the Goods Movement Advisory Committee in the section entitled “Goods movement – Port and Rail on page 75.</p> <p>It is premature to identify funding for improvements to the I-710 corridor, including truck lanes, until the I-710 Major Investment Study is completed. Recommendations for congestion relief will be forthcoming from this MIS and considered for inclusion in future updates to the project lists and the RTP. The Goods Movement Advisory Committee's non-prioritized list of projects, focus areas and needed studies (page 76), includes truck lanes but does not break out specific truck lane projects. The GMAC did identify the need to study the feasibility of truck lanes on the I-710 in its matrix of issues, problems and potential solutions in Appendix E (page E-23, bullet 1 under Land-side Access/Potential Solutions).</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p><b>4.</b> <b>Truck Lanes and Truck Climbing Lanes –</b> The I-710 Truck Lanes should be included within or added to the \$3.64 billion in public funding identified for truck lanes throughout the region. Table 5.11 lists truck lane projects, which are funded, and Table 5.13 lists truck lane projects, which are not funded. The I-710 (SR 60 to Port of Long Beach) is listed among the unfunded projects in Table 5.13. No preliminary feasibility studies have been completed for the projects in Table 5.11, and two have not yet begun. The I-710's preliminary study has begun, yet no funding has been identified for it. Virtually all of the projects listed for funding will receive significant truck traffic originating on the I-710 from the Port of Long Beach. It would be reasonable and rational to also fund truck lane projects on the I-710 originating at the source of much of the truck traffic impacting Los Angeles and all of the surrounding counties.</p> <p><b>5.</b> <b>Post 2025 Long Range Corridors/ Southwest Passage Corridor –</b> The Southwest Passage Corridor does not include the I-710 to the Port of Long Beach, and it should be included.</p> <p><b>6.</b> <b>Sub-regional Issues of Importance – <i>Freight Movement Projects:</i></b> Exhibit 5.8 of the 2001 Draft RTP should be amended to include the Gateway Cities Grade-Crossing Program. <b>Railroad Grade-Crossings:</b> The 2001 Draft Funds have not been committed for constructing any truck lane project on I-710. Funds have been made available for studies for SR-60 and I-15 (Table 5-13), and some <i>funding sources</i> have been identified for constructing the SR-60, based on feasibility study work completed to date. The feasibility of truck lanes has yet to be determined for the I-710. Upon completion of the I-710 Major Infrastructure Study, recommendations for congestion relief will be considered for inclusion in the RTP update.</p> <p>We agree and the Plan has been modified.</p> <p>Freight movement projects—Exhibit 5.8 does identify the Gateway Cities Grade Crossing Program as part of the Draft Plan.</p> <p>Railroad Grade Crossings—The final RTP has been modified to show a lump-sum amount for grade crossings per Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's Long Range Transportation Plan.</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>RTP lists eight grade-crossing projects, including the Gateway Cities list in the Constrained Projects List for \$110 million. The implementation schedule should be moved up from 2020 to no later than 2010 and the funding requirement should be increased from \$110 million to at least \$140 million.</p>	<p>The total amount of funds allocated for Los Angeles County is \$560 million under their Constrained Program Scenario.</p>
City of Los Angeles Ronald F. Deaton Chief Legislative Analyst City of Los Angeles City Hall Los Angeles, CA 90012-4886 213/580-1195	<p>See comments on Draft 2001 PEIR in Letter L7 in Response to Comments, Final PEIR Addendum, April 2001, Comments 1-39.</p> <p>40.</p> <p>The following comments reflect review of the Draft 2001 RTP Update through the lens of the City's General Plan, in particular the Transportation Element. Note that the Transportation Element, as well as the General Plan Framework, have year 2010 planning horizons, unlike this draft RTP Update which has a year 2025 planning horizon – although the comments submitted here on Chapter IV (Planning Assumptions) reflect the views of this Department's Demographics Unit which now routinely analyzes data and projections beyond year 2010.</p>	<p>See Letter L7 in Response to Comments, Final PEIR Addendum, April 2001, Responses 1-39.</p> <p>40.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>There is no question that the maintenance of regional conformity with Federal regulation is a shared goal for both the City and SCAG through the three-year RTP cycles, the substantial congruency with the City's General Plan should also be maintained from the 1998 RTP to the 2001 RTP Update.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>41. <b>Chapter III – Transportation Planning Framework</b>            The goals and policies set forth in this draft Update are virtually unchanged from the 1998 RTP and remain congruent with the City's adopted General Plan.</p>	<p>41. Comment noted.</p>
	<p>42. <b>Chapter IV – Planning Assumptions – Rate of projected growth</b>            There are counter-intuitive discrepancies between the 98 RTP growth forecast (to year 2020) and this 2001 Update growth forecast to year 2025 which are not fully explained, although this reduced population/employment growth forecast will be somewhat easier for the region to accommodate.</p>	<p>The development of the 2001 RTP Socioeconomic Forecast was based on a well-defined process that is thoroughly documented on pages A-19 through A-22 of Appendix A (Socio-Economic) of the Draft 2001 RTP Update. The Forecasting Technical Task Force (FTTF), composed of technical experts and subregional representatives, examined the levels of population and employment growth in the 1998 RTP Socioeconomic Forecast and recommended changes to several of the key assumptions, particularly regarding future employment growth.</p> <p>In addition, two noted regional economists (Steve Levy of the Center for the Continuing Study of the California Economy and Dr. John Husing of Politics and Economics, Inc.) completed studies on the assumptions regarding future employment growth. Their findings indicated the levels of employment and population growth implied in the 1998 RTP Socioeconomic Forecast were too high and should be revised downward. They felt that it was unrealistic to assume that the region would capture 15% of U.S. job growth over the forecast period. They recommended that a 7% share of national employment growth was more realistic and consistent with past trends. This change in assumptions resulted in an approximate one million job reduction in projected 2020 employment and a corresponding decrease in regional population growth. These recommendations were supported by a workshop of key regional economists and demographers that was held in December 1999.</p>
		<p>43. <b>Disruption of projected growth</b> – This Update forecast projects a significant shift of employment growth from Los Angeles County</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>(and the City) to the Inland Empire, resulting in a reduced City and County share of regional employment in 2025. As such this forecast contradicts past performance, and contradicts General Plan objectives and policies regarding economic development which seek to maintain or even enhance the City's share of regional employment.</p> <p>If these trends were projected into the future the Los Angeles County share of total regional employment would decline to only 46% by the year 2025. However, the 2025 employment projected for Los Angeles County was approximately 5.3 million which represents 53% of total regional employment. The Riverside and San Bernardino county shares of total regional employment were projected to increase to 20% by the year 2025.</p>	<p>The employment forecast for Los Angeles County therefore supports rather than contradicts recent trends.</p> <p>44. <b>Politicization of the modeling/forecast process</b>            – There appears to be an intrusion of politics early on in this exercise as reflected in this unexplained shift of economic development to, and dramatically improved economic performance by the Inland Empire.</p> <p>45. <b>Chapter V – Strategic Investments</b>  <b>Highways and arterials-</b> this discussion is consistent with the Transportation Element.</p> <p>46. <b>Regional Transit</b> – One of the City's designated priority transit corridors is not listed (Downtown connector; Long Beach Blue Line at San Pedro/Washington to Union Station via</p> <p>in the Inland Empire. The historical analysis indicated that the Los Angeles County share of total regional employment declined from 75% in 1972 to 60% in 1999. The Riverside and San Bernardino County share of total regional employment increased from 9% to 14% during the same period. This analysis is referenced in Appendix A in the response to Comment 42 above. The employment analysis is consistent with the RHNA household/employment growth forecast for 2002-2005.</p> <p>As discussed in the response to bullet #43 above, the shift of employment from Los Angeles County to the Inland Empire is consistent with long-term historical trends. It is not purely a political exercise and it does not reflect an unexplained shift of economic development. The recommended forecast was presented to and approved by the SCAG Community, Economic and Human Development (CEHD) Committee composed of representatives from throughout the SCAG region.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>The Transit Corridor Task Force worked with the county transportation commissions to develop transit corridors for the 2001 RTP. The Blue Line extension via Alameda/San Pedro was discussed but not proposed as a priority transit corridor. The LACMTA released their LRTP after SCAG. Since the</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>release we have incorporated several Rapid Bus corridors including Pico Boulevard and Western Avenue.</p>
		<p>47. SCAG will work with the City on all planning efforts and implementation timelines to address the City's Transportation Element.</p>
		<p>47. <b>MAGLEV</b> – High speed rail is not specifically addressed in the Transportation Element, except that Union Station is designated as the regional hub; a recent (June 2000) City Council action supported Phase I MAGLEV with endpoints of March AFB/Riverside and Union Station [not LAX as in this draft Update.]</p> <p>48. <b>Goods Movement</b> – This discussion is generally consistent with the General Plan except that the Transportation Element is mute on the proposal of dedicated truck lanes on freeways; there is reason to share MTA's skepticism about the costs effectiveness and safety of this proposal.</p> <p>49. <b>Aviation</b> – the 1998 RTP Aviation sub-chapter is consistent with the Transportation Element; as of this date SCAG staff and the TCC have not released their final recommendation for this Update. Note that the Transportation Element supports expansion of regional airports but also acknowledges the critical role of LAX.</p> <p>50. <b>TDM + Nonmotorized</b> – this discussion is consistent with the General Plan from a policy</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>perspective; there are a number of statistics provided, however, which need correction.</p> <p>51. <b>ITS</b> – this discussion is consistent with the General Plan, although there are no “smart street” projects listed on p. 64 (Table 5.8) in Los Angeles County.</p> <p>52. <b>Land Use/Transportation</b> – this discussion is consistent with the General Plan; the City has been a leader in promoting these policies and strategies.</p> <p>53. <b>Chapter VI – Finance</b> As always, we must question the fiction of the “Regional Checkbook” approach which gives the impression that there is no County sovereignty, by dealing with revenues and expenditures as a five county aggregate.</p>	<p>51. LA County has significant funding for arterial ITS improvements, however, there are no arterials identified specifically as “smart streets.”</p> <p>52. Comment noted.</p> <p>53. The regional checkbook incorporates a county by county analysis.</p> <p>54. This draft Update paints a far more pessimistic picture for Los Angeles County (\$8.2 billion deficit through 2025 with just Baseline + O&amp;M) than either the Transportation Element research or the draft MTA Long Range Plan. It is radically different from the 1998 RTP analysis.</p> <p>55. SCAG appears to have completely rejected cost savings/increased efficiencies from transit restructuring, based solely on the period 1998 to mid- 2000, even though the 98 RTP projected</p> <p>54. SCAG staff has worked closely with LACMTA staff in an attempt to achieve consistency between the RTP and the LRTP.</p> <p>55. SCAG created a Regional Transit Task Force (RTTF) comprised of transit operators and transportation commissions from the entire region. The RTTF discussed and analyzed transit restructuring and concluded that \$2.6 billion was not a realistic savings. SCAG staff has worked closely with LACMTA staff in</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	nearly \$2.6 billion in savings accruing over the life of the plan (through to 2020).	an attempt to achieve consistency between the RTP and the LRTP. One important change will be the addition of some restructuring in Los Angeles County. The LACMTA has not calculated a savings from this restructuring. The restructuring will provide an opportunity to deploy more needed service on the heavier traveled corridors.
	56.	Comment noted.
	57.	The Transportation Element only supports “study” of “innovative financing,” with no reference to any specific tax or fee; it does call for “active support” of “state or federal legislation which generate funding, with growth potential, for transportation infrastructure.”
	58.	SCAG’s alternative fuel penetration assumptions are based upon analysis of current CARB policies concerning the introduction of ZEVs as well as SIP requirements. SCAG simply recognizes that a heavy market penetration of these alternative fuel vehicles would require reconsidering the current practice of providing tax incentives for alternative fuel vehicles. As alternative fuel vehicles become more prevalent on the roads, costs for road repair would need to be shared. Cost allocation should be proportional to use. SCAG recognizes that further study is required to assess market penetration and in turn, taxing alternatives. Consequently, SCAG is pursuing state budget augmentation for such a study.
	59.	Comment noted.
		<b>Chapter VIII – Future Link</b> This discussion is little changed from the 98 RTP and remains consistent with the General Plan, but LADOT and MTA need to closely review the Unconstrained Projects list in the Appendix to ensure inclusion of potential priority projects.

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>The SCAG's Draft 2001 RTP and MTA's Draft 2001 LRTP has been reviewed for inclusion of LADOT's previous project submissions and requests. The RTP contains a Baseline, a Financially Constrained Project List and an Unconstrained Project List; projects not in the Baseline or Financially Constrained Project List have no funding earmark. The LRTP contains a Baseline, a Constrained Plan and a Strategic Plan; projects not in the Baseline or Constrained Plan have no funding earmark. In some programming categories, specific projects are not identified but overall funding allocations are set. Attached are lists of projects submitted to SCAG.</p>	<p>Projects submitted were incorporated into the RTP to the extent that they were within the fiscal constraints of the plan based on performance.</p>
City of Manhattan Beach	<p>Laurie B. Jester Senior Planner City of Manhattan Beach City Hall 1400 Highland Avenue Manhattan Beach, CA 90266-4795 310/802-5500 310/802-5501 – fax</p>	<p>1. The Department supports transportation policies that take a regional approach to growth of the aviation system, as stated in Policies 8, 18, 19 and 20 of the Transportation Planning Policies and Objectives, and as described in Scenarios 2 and 8.</p> <p>2. The Green Line extension into the LAX terminal as shown on Table 5.12 and Exhibit 5.6 as part of the 2025 Proposed Transit Corridors is a project that will benefit the region.</p> <p>3. The trading of Telecommute Credits in order to reach average vehicle ridership goals is a program that we believe should be explored.</p> <p>4.</p>	<p>1, 2, 3, 4 SCAG appreciates your supportive comments on the aviation, transit, and livable communities aspects of the RTP. Your suggestion regarding the trading of telecommute credits will be evaluated.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
City of Monrovia	<p>Hon. Robert T. Bartlett            Mayor            City of Monrovia            415 South Ivy Avenue            Monrovia, CA 91016            626/932-5520 (fax)</p> <p>Investments in Non-Motorized Transportation consistent with the Livable Communities vision, as well as the Land Use Transportation Livable Communities Strategy is beneficial to the region.</p>	<p>1-5</p> <p>This extension is listed in the long-range corridor list, which can be found in Technical Appendix D and will be studied by SCAG in the future.</p>	
City of Placentia	<p>Joyce Rosenthal            Planning Department            City of Placentia            401 East Chapman Avenue            Placentia, CA 92870            714/961-0283 - fax</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>included in the RTP. The Orange County subregion is experiencing rapid growth and increased traffic congestion. Not only would the proposed improvements benefit our subregion, but added together, they would also improve traffic congestion and air quality for the neighboring subregions and beyond.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>The one issue that was raised by the OCCOG TAC members at the March 6, 2001, OCCOG RTP workshop was, “The discussions related to transit in the RTP do not distinguish between rail and bus. It would be helpful if the text and graphics were revised to make the distinction and allow the reader better understanding of costs, usage, and benefits of transit by mode instead of a composite whole.” We recommend that this issue be clarified in the RTP.</p>	<p>2.</p> <p>SCAG concurs with the comment and will reflect the suggestion to the extent possible in the final RTP.</p>
City of Simi Valley  Al Boughey Director Department of Environmental Services  City of Simi Valley 2929 Tapo Canyon Road Simi Valley, CA 93063-2199 805/583-6700	<p>1. The Draft RTP may be based on unrealistic funding assumptions.</p> <p>2. The Draft RTP devotes too much of the region's limited resources to transit.</p> <p>3. As more urban infill development takes place, cities will be forced to choose between expanding their surface road networks or accepting higher levels of congestion.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. See response to US Environmental Protection Agency, bullet 5.</p> <p>2. Decision making with regards to regional transportation investments is the responsibility of elected members of the County Transportation Commissions and SCAG's Regional Council.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>4.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>SCAG should urge the PUC to adopt reasonable safety standards to allow the installation of smart at-grade crossings without a lengthy PUC review process.</p>	<p>SCAG will be conducting a study of the main rail lines between Los Angeles and the Inland Empire that includes research on potential ITS applications for improving grade crossings. One element of this work involves identifying interagency coordination requirements, including strategies for expediting implementation. This particular component of the study should be useful for rail safety studies elsewhere in the region.</p>
City of Torrance	<p>Jill Crump Transportation Planner City of Torrance 3031 Torrance Blvd. Torrance, CA 90503</p>	<p>1. The South Bay Cities, especially the City of Torrance, hopes that SCAG will continue to recognize the value in investing well-deserved funds to our subregion for the maintenance and operation of our arterial roadway system, transit services, ITS, TDM, and helping to establish the reality of Livable Communities.</p> <p>Recognition must be given to the unique geography of the South Bay such that we are relatively underserved by freeways and rail transit. From a regional perspective, a higher percentage of our home to work trips are made on local arterial roadways in comparison to other subregions. The RTP should place more emphasis on supporting the investment already made in the South Bay, and leveraging improvements to this infrastructure to support infill. The increment of cost for maintaining and enhancing capacity of our existing infrastructure will go a lot farther in terms of supporting housing and jobs than will the cost of building new infrastructure.</p>
City of Walnut	<p>Roger Friesen Community Development Director City of Walnut P. O. Box 682</p>	<p>1. The Draft obviously needs tuning and some elements have yet to be completed but the draft does address the major issue and presents goals and objectives and even sets forth costs that has</p> <p>1. Comment noted.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE
RTP			RTP
	Walnut, CA 91788	<p>a bottom line of not enough funds are available via existing sources.</p> <p>2. While every element of the overall Transportation System is important to Walnut, there are some that may have little effect on Walnut, i.e., Maglev, but others will directly impact or effect Walnut i.e. Ports, Rail and Trucks and Aviation and Ground Access.</p> <p>3. With regard to Aviation, the present push to expand LAX without strongly considering the expansion of Ontario, Palmdale, etc., is unsound.</p> <p>4. Rail or trucks are important elements to Walnut in that they will directly impact traffic and hence the way of life in Walnut. Walnut needs to support more funding for grade separations along the Alameda Corridor East project and most certainly very strongly support the truck lane issue on SR60.. how the truck traffic issue is resolved will result in major shifts in traffic circulation in the adjoining areas that can either enhance or drastically alter community values.</p> <p>5. It would seem that the direction to pursue for SR60 as it relates to truck traffic is to begin to think out of the box and look to new design concepts using the existing facilities of the SR60</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>3. SCAG has looked at numerous ways of decentralizing aviation facilities and demand throughout the region. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p> <p>4.5</p> <p>Trucks are necessary for the movement of goods within the region, because there is very minor rail network coverage to businesses and stores across southern California, as compared to the road network. This means that short-haul shipments would require a truck dray at both ends of the trip with a short rail haul in the middle, which would impose tremendous delay and cost to goods movement. Rail is predominant only in the long-haul markets with a shipment length of over 800 miles—and even this requires a local truck dray within the region.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>corridor or even look at the issue of where the trucks are coming from and where are they going - perhaps the goods need to stay on rails for a longer ride, or maybe the trucks should only operate at night.</p> <p>6. Separate truck lanes and separated from SR60 does not appear to be a solution – when a suggested solution brings forth so many negative disruptions to existing communities, it need not be advance.</p> <p>7. Overall the Draft should be supported and the success of any transportation plan for the future needs constant monitoring and the planning process has to be continuous.</p>	<p>6. The proposal to place part of the SR-60 truck lane project along the San Jose Creek R/W was recently rejected by the Regional Council and is not part of the plan.</p> <p>7. Comment noted.</p>
Coachella Valley Association of Governments	<p>Anne Azzu CVAG 73-710 Fred Waring Drive Palm Desert, CA 92260 760/346-1127 760/340-5949 - fax</p>	<p>1. All maps in the document do not cover the whole Coachella Valley</p> <p>2. My understanding from our conversation that the RTP document is a policy document and that the RTP does not include projects that are under construction or projects that are already programmed and included in the RTIP. It would be very useful to indicate that in the executive summary of the RTP report, so when the agencies read it they have an understanding of the difference between the RTP and RTIP.</p>
Coachella	Tom Levy	<p>1.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Valley Water District	General Manager-Chief Engineer Coachella Valley Water District P. O. Box 1058 Coachella, CA 92236	<p>We reviewed the Draft 2001 RTP and have no comments. The proposed transportation plan is not anticipated to have any significant affect on facilities owned and operated by this district.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
Department of the Navy Naval Base Ventura County	Vivian Goo Deputy Public Works Officer Department of the Navy Naval Base Ventura County 311 Main Road, Suite 1 Point Mugu, CA 93042-5001 805/989-9785	<p>1. We have reviewed the Draft RTP and did not find any specific references to the Naval Base Ventura County (NBVC) sites at Point Mugu and Port Hueneme. Therefore, we would like to know if any considerations were given to our facilities during the preparation of your report.</p> <p>1. The Draft RTP does not specifically refer to military bases in the region, with the exception of potential airports. This does not mean that the transportation needs in Ventura County have not been addressed. The proposed investments in Ventura County are a result of local input and the need to address regional transportation concerns, which include but are not limited to air quality, mobility, and environmental justice. Also, see response to the Ventura County Transportation Commission.</p>
Federal Highway Administration	Leslie Rogers Regional Administrator Michael Ritchie Division Administrator U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration 201 N. Figueroa, Ste. 1450 Los Angeles, CA 90012 213/202-3950 213/202-3961 – fax	<p><b>Planning Assumptions</b></p> <p>1. The plan should reflect a multi-modal evaluation of the transportation network (i.e. transit, pedestrian, highway, and bicycle). Pedestrian and bicycle access is a major component of the supporting infrastructure for transit as well as “livable communities;” therefore, more emphasis needs to be placed on those components. Opportunities for further development and safety of the regional bicycle and pedestrian network should be analyzed and integrated into your discussion of the transportation plan.</p> <p>2. The plan should identify the adopted congestion management strategies for the six counties, and demonstrate a systematic approach in developing these strategies, specifically, a brief</p> <p>1. The plan evaluation is based on consideration of the multi-modal system to the extent possible within the limitations of the available planning tools. The plan does acknowledge the significance of the region’s non-motorized transportation system as a component of the multi-modal system. SCAG intends to consider a more in-depth planning and analysis of the non-motorized component in future plan updates.</p> <p>2. SCAG has made the CMS an integral part of the regional transportation planning process, including the 2001 RTP Update. In the region, the CMS process is comprised of the combined activities of the RTP, the five counties’ Congestion Management Programs (CMPS of the Los Angeles, Orange,</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>3. Although MTA is a major transit provider within the six counties, there is an assortment of other transit providers, thus, more emphasis needs to be placed on the other transit providers as they relate to the transportation network for the region as a whole. Additionally, the list of projects in the MTA's Long Range Plan and SCAG's Long Range Plan should be scrutinized for consistency.</p> <p>4. The Plan focuses mainly on the capital expenditures of transit versus the benefits of highway without recognizing the lack of investment that this region has made in transit in the past decades. The truth of the matter is that the investment in transit for a metropolitan area of this magnitude has not kept pace with the transportation needs, and to simply discount transit because of the magnitude of the capital expenditure and complexity of planning is inconsistent with the need for development of a multi-modal transportation network</p> <p>5. Further, documentation on the Alternative Funding Strategy proposed to address projected funding shortfalls for the 2001 SCAG RTP should be provided. Specific documentation should include the following: (1) past and</p> <p>Riverside, San Bernardino, and Ventura counties), and the RTP.</p> <p>The CMS portion of the RTP will be incorporated into the Final 2001 RTP Update - Appendices.</p> <p>3. The MTA, as stated in the draft RTP, provides 70% of the region's transit trips. SCAG concurs that to have a 'regional' network, it must focus on the other transit providers, large and small, that serve the region. Representatives of large and small transit providers were members of SCAG's Transit Advisory Committee, which developed the Transit component of the 2001 RTP. SCAG staff has worked closely with LACMTA staff in an attempt to achieve consistency between the RTP and the LRTP.</p> <p>4. SCAG recognizes that there has been a lack of investment in transit in past decades. A cost-effective transit system is vital for the sustainability of this region. Accordingly, SCAG continues to consider further options for securing financing.</p> <p>5. Technical Appendix F provides further documentation on the proposed alternative funding strategy. For example, Technical Appendix F provides a table showing historical adjustments to the gas tax back to 1923. SCAG will include further discussion concerning past and prospective legislative efforts to implement these strategies. SCAG will clearly indicate that the proposed</p>		

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>prospective state legislative efforts to address the two-thirds voter approval requirement for the imposition, extension or increase of "special" taxes by local governments; (2) support by the county sales tax agencies in the SCAG region for the Alternative Funding Strategy; (3) discussion of the effect of the Revenue Raising Mechanism on Alternative Fuel Vehicles on the number of alternative fuel vehicles that will be sold in the South Coast Air Basin over the timeframe of the 2001 RTP; and (4) support by the SCAG Policy Board for the adjustments to the State Excise Motor Fuel Tax Rate, or an equivalent regional fuel tax.</p> <p>6. The Final SCAG Transportation Conformity Report should incorporate sufficient financial information from the Financial Plan for the SCAG 2001 RTP to document that the requirement for a financially constrained transportation plan has been met. In connection to the assumptions made to derive a fiscally constrained plan, specific projects such as the MAGLEV should be analyzed to verify the ability to implement within the time frame projected in the Long Range Plan. It is not advisable to believe that the MAGLEV will provide air quality or mobility improvements in the time frame suggested.</p> <p>7. A discussion of the vehicle age data and type is most appropriate. Presumably, current data will be used in the final RTP document. If the information is not current, justification needs to</p> <p>alternative fuel tax would not occur until 2010. By adopting the final RTP, SCAG's Regional Council will express support for fuel tax adjustments.</p> <p>6. SCAG's 2001 RTP contains a financial plan whose assumptions are both reasonable and supported by data in Technical Appendix F. Regarding Maglev, SCAG has undertaken extensive analysis of the LAX-to-March segment, including financial analysis that has been substantiated through an independent review by Goldman-Sachs. The LAX-Palmdale segment has been moved to a later timeframe, with milestones established to monitor progress. Milestones for the LAX – March segment are provided in the plan.</p> <p>7. In short, the vehicle registration (i.e., age) distributions, mileage accumulation rates, technology splits and vehicle type mixes used in the RTP emission analyses represent the most <u>currently available</u> data. A detailed explanation is provided below.</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	be provided.	<p>SCAG used three different versions of the "EMFAC" emission factor models developed by the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to perform the regional emissions analyses in the RTP as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>## EMFACT7F - for the 1994 SIP areas;</li> <li>## MVEI7G (which contains EMFACT7G) - for the 1997 (1999 amended) SIP areas; and</li> <li>## MVEI7G-1c (which contains EMFACT7G1C) - for the non-budget emissions analysis areas.</li> </ul> <p>Each of these versions consist of a series of related computer programs that are executed in sequence to generate composite on-road fleet emission factors as listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>## WEIGHT – generates age distributions, mileage accumulation rates and technology splits by vehicle class;</li> <li>## EMFAC – computes calendar year composite emission factors by vehicle class and ambient conditions (e.g., speed and temperature);</li> <li>## REPORT – produces formatted tables of the EMFAC emission factors; and</li> <li>## BURDEN – estimates region-wide vehicle emissions (in tons/day) by combining emission factors with regional travel activity and fleet mix data.</li> </ul> <p>(The REPORT is not used in the RTP conformity analyses. Fleet mix information from BURDEN is used with the DTIM model to calculate <u>emissions</u> from <u>emission factors</u> and <u>activity data</u>. This approach is consistent with that used to generate the applicable SIP budgets.)</p> <p>The EMFACT7F model was finalized in September 1993. MVEI7G was released in October 1996 and was updated in three successive revisions in July 1997, October 1998 and February 2000, all referred to as MVEI7G-1c.</p> <p>ARB has published a chronological summary of changes in each of these emission factor models releases</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
COMMENTS		
	<p>(<a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/doctabletest/documents/Model_History.doc">http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/doctabletest/documents/Model_History.doc</a>).</p> <p>From a review of that model history, SCAG determined that vehicle registration/age distributions, mileage accumulation rates and technology mixes were last updated in EMFAC7F, <u>but were not changed</u> through the releases of MVEI7G and MVEI7G-Ic.</p> <p>Vehicle type mixes were updated several times in the three releases of MVEI7G-Ic. SCAG used the latest vehicle type splits from the final (February 2000) release of MVEI7G-Ic as input to DTIM to develop fleet composite emission estimates in the RTP emissions analyses.</p> <p>SCAG also evaluated the feasibility of utilizing updated information on age distributions, mileage accumulation rates, etc. that are being implemented in ARB's EMFAC2000 model. To date EMFAC2000 has not been approved for use. Unfortunately, EMFAC2000 was programmed in a manner that makes it difficult, if not impossible, to "extract" the vehicle age distributions and other fleet information it contains. Unlike its EMFAC7F and MVEI7G predecessors, EMFAC2000 is a single, entirely self-contained program. All information such as registration/age distributions, mileage accumulation rates and vehicle type mixes that could be easily accessed from external data tables or output files in the EMFAC7F and MVEI7G modeling packages are now embedded in programming statements within the EMFAC2000 program. In addition, EMFAC2000 extended the number of explicit vehicle ages being tracked from 25 years to 35 years, which would require "mapping" the distributions back to a structure that could be applied within the EMFAC7F/MVEI7G packages. Another consideration is that EMFAC2000 has not been approved by EPA.</p> <p>As a result of the <u>extreme</u> effort required to extract vehicle fleet information from EMFAC2000, SCAG used those data from EMFAC7F/MVEI7G as discussed above because they represent the most current and <u>readily available</u> data.</p> <p><sup>8</sup> The Final SCAG Transportation Conformity Report should document the changes made to the Zero Emission Vehicle Program by the</p>	<p>8. The ZEV mandate regulations have been substantially modified in recent years. Some of these changes have included: (a) a delay in the ZEV requirement from 1998 to 2003; (b) the addition of multipliers, for range and other vehicle</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>California Air Resources Board and discuss how those changes may affect the credit taken for that program in the conformity analysis for the SCAG 2001 RTP.</p> <p>9. The Final SCAG Transportation Conformity Report should discuss the Settlement Agreement that resulted from litigation related to measures in the 1994 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and the 1997 AQMP, and provide an implementation status of the measures subject to the Settlement Agreement.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Specific Comments</b></p> <p>10. Appendix H, Page 16, Construction Emissions Analyses: The document states that there is no need to address section 93.122(d)(2) of the Transportation Conformity Rule because there are no applicable (EPA approved) PM10 state implementation plans in the SCAG region. EPA guidance dated October 28, 1996, explains the intent of section 93.122(d)(2), and makes it clear that this requirement applies in PM10 non-attainment or maintenance areas where there are submitted or approved state implementation plans. If those state implementation plans identify construction as a contributor to the PM10 air quality problem, a regional PM10 construction emissions analysis is required. If</p>		

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>construction is a contributor to the PM10 air quality problem in the following state implementation plans, a regional analysis is required:</p> <p>South Coast 1997 PM10 SIP            Salton Sea 1997 PM10 SIP            Mojave Desert 1995 PM10 SIP            Searles Valley 1996 SIP</p> <p>11. Appendix H, Pages 90, 92 and 93: The tables on these pages should specifically list each of the measures under the categories "Total Control Factors" and "Control Measures Credit".</p>	<p>11. The components of the total control factors composed of the three measures: Enhanced I/M, State and Federal Measures, and On-road Black Box Measures SCAG used the total of these three sub-measures for regional emissions analysis.</p> <p>For the list of individual measures, see the control factor tables, produced by ARB, in Exhibit C of Appendix H. The control measure credit is directly related to the proportion of each sub-measure to the total credit.</p>
Long Beach Transit	<p>Laurence W. Jackson            President and General Manager            Long Beach Transit            P. O. Box 731            1963 E. Anaheim Street            Long Beach, CA 90801-0731            562/591-8753            562/218-1994 – fax</p>	<p>1. We have concerns, that the plan, as written, implies that the investment being made in transit in Los Angeles County is inappropriate. First, the cost mode split between transit and highways may be inaccurate since local streets (the vast majority of all road/freeway miles) appear not to be included in the cost figures. Road maintenance costs are not included in MTA's plan either.</p> <p>2. Second, the greatest part of the transit costs are related to the MTA which is building needed rail and rapid bus lines. These lines will increase ridership, as shown to date. Yes, they are costly now but they are an investment like a freeway</p>	<p>1. Financially, SCAG's 2001 RTP simply lays out current and forecasted levels of expenditures for transit. You are correct that local streets and roads are not included in the mode- split analysis. The mode split exercise tries to assess expenditure levels for transit, highways, and major arterials. We will specifically note that local streets and roads are not included in the analysis. We will also note that the high cost of transit expenditures is mostly due to MTA's rail, rapid bus, and consent decree expenditures. SCAG staff has worked closely with LACMTA staff in an attempt to achieve consistency between the RTP and the LRTP.</p> <p>2. The Transportation and Communications Committee has adopted a goal to maintain the 1997 level of per capita ridership. This does equate to a 40% increase in ridership. To achieve this goal, the RTP proposes a variety of new projects, as well as service expansion of the existing system.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>which pays off exponentially over the years, as more miles are built and connected to other rail and bus lines. MTA should definitely hold down the costs of these lines and reduce its bus operations costs, which would help reduce the financial impact of the consent decree. But an expansion and variety of transit services are needed.</p> <p>3. Third, the plan needs to recognize the mobility that many transit systems throughout the region provide, at much less cost than MTA. Funding to these agencies needs to be increased to improve the cost-effectiveness of transit service overall. Long Beach Transit, for example, needs to accommodate a dramatic growth in ridership that is stretching our system to its limits. We have managed our costs and added new service within our means, but we are at the limit of our financial ability to provide needed additional service. Without these funds, we are at risk of severe overloading of the system. Increased operating dollars are Long Beach Transit's number one priority to meet the demand for increased service.</p> <p>4. Fourth, transit service is a life-line service to the majority of its riders and therefore must be continued. Demand for transit is increasing. Further, to attract discretionary riders, local and direct, express routes must be increased.</p> <p>5.</p>	<p>SCAG concurs with improving the cost-effectiveness of transit service. The appendix provides several charts that show cost per person for the major operators in the region. These charts do in fact show that many transit operators are functioning well with low costs.</p> <p>SCAG recognizes that transit operations will require an increased amount of funds to maintain the current level of service. Also, as you have pointed out, your needs are growing as well as the other operators in the region. To help with this concern, SCAG is considering financial strategies that will work toward securing more flexible funds for the region.</p> <p>One focus for transit, while improving the region's mobility and air quality, is to provide attractive public transit options for the discretionary rider while serving the needs of the transit dependent. Future plans include adding more express service to the region. The draft plan illustrated a 6% increase, in route miles, a figure that will only grow with the inclusion of the LACMTA RTP's additional rapid bus network.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>The increased demand for transit over the past few years is downplayed in the Plan and, instead, the decline in prior years is highlighted. These sections need to be revised. Further, ridership data is only used through FY 98 when more recent data is available and would show the trend continuing of increasing ridership</p> <p>6.</p> <p>A final general concern is that the LACMTA's draft Long Range Transportation Plan differs from SCAG's RTP in several places. These need to be consistent, with the LRTP feeding into the RTP.</p> <p>7.</p> <p>Pg. 4 – We concur with the need to replace gas tax revenues which may be lost due to a growing use of alternative-fuel vehicles; the need to ensure an increased source of revenue for the operations and maintenance of the existing transportation systems; the need to continue the dedication of the sales tax on gasoline; the approach of assuming continuation of the 1997 annual per capita transit ridership rather than the less realistic increase of 246% considered, and that transit should supply a higher portion of the nodal split, as LACMTA's LRTP projects, and all means of accomplishing that should be considered; maintaining and operating the existing system takes precedence over expansion; and, the "fundamental transit policy questions" you have raised should be further analyzed, however, this should be done at the county-wide level rather than the regional level.</p>	<p>The 1999 data was not available when the Draft RTP 2001 was prepared. The text will be updated where possible to include 1999 data.</p> <p>6.</p> <p>SCAG staff has worked closely with LACMTA staff in an attempt to achieve consistency between the RTP and LRTP.</p> <p>7.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>8. We request that the transit ridership paragraph be rewritten to first reflect and emphasize the most current trends in transit ridership (since 1995) instead of the heavy emphasis on the past years from 1985-95. We believe the most recent data should be used for planning. Further, Table 4.3 shows no increase in local bus route miles and only 6% in express bus route miles between 1997 and 2025. This is also reflected on page 41, Table 5.2 for "Plan Improvements". Yet rail shows major increases. We believe this is an inaccurate view of transit. Local transit routes are the backbone of transit systems in Los Angeles County. Express bus routes such as the new MTA Rapid Bus routes are hugely successful, and are also planned in MTA's LRTP. They will increase much more than 6%.</p> <p>9. SCAG continues to emphasize the reduction in transit ridership prior to 1995, rather than the increases since then. We believe the recent increases should be highlighted first.</p>	<p>8. As a planning agency, SCAG is required to look at future years as well as trends in the past. The text will be revised to try and place more emphasis on recent trends but still must use past trends.</p> <p>9. Answered in previous response.</p> <p>10. Your figure 5.2 shows a continued decrease in the number of people riding transit to work. Long Beach Transit ridership does not support this. Further, the LACMTA draft LRTP projects an increase in mode split of commute trips on transit from 8.5% in 1998 to 14.8% in 2025. At the same time, the majority of all trips are for school, shopping, medical and social. Recognition needs to be given that transit supports many other types than just work trips.</p> <p>10. SCAG agrees with the need to illustrate that transit supports many other types of trips than just work trips and the text will be edited where possible to illustrate this.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>11. Transit service is provided by a lot more than 22 separate public agencies. In the Gateway Cities COG area, 26 separate agencies provide transit service, 21 of which are fixed route service. How do you define "local service?" You say "local service is supplemented by municipal lines and shuttle services." Municipal operators provide local, shuttle and express service. Clarification is needed. You say the upward trend of ridership is credited to rail, yet in our service area, LBT has had a 30% increase in ridership in 5 years on buses alone. Also, LBT's costs to provide service have not grown exponentially but rather closer to CPI, as is true of most municipal operators in LA County. You need to be more specific in your representations.</p> <p>12. Please note that the included and eligible municipal operators in LA County carry 100 million passenger trips annually, similar to systems such as Baltimore and Miami. This level of service is hardly "supplemental" but rather is a major part of the backbone service in the county (also applicable to page 73, 4<sup>th</sup> bullet).</p> <p>13. SCAG does not indicate if it investigated the reasons for the drop in transit ridership after 1986 (Fig. 5.3). We believe a large portion may have been due to the end of the reduced fare program in LA County and also the emphasis being placed on rail construction by MTA to the</p>	<p>11. Clarifications will be considered in the final RTP as appropriate.</p> <p>12. Comment noted. Comment will be considered for incorporation into the final RTP as appropriate.</p> <p>13. SCAG agrees that the drop in transit ridership was due to the end of the reduced fare program.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>14. You indicated "Lack of financial viability continues to create a disincentive for additional investments in transit." From the context, we would guess you are speaking about the MTA but this is unclear. Perhaps your intent was to say that MTA still needs to reduce costs in order to balance its budget using its fair share of the county's transit dollars.</p> <p>15. In regard to transit as a "social safety net," that is indeed a primary function it services. However, it also should serve discretionary riders.</p> <p>16. The region should definitely not adopt a single alternative fuel standard for transit vehicles. The SCAQMD and ARB are addressing this matter. Fuel types should not be specified. Rather emissions levels should be set, so that operators have as much flexibility in how to meet those levels as possible.</p> <p>17. You indicate "To implement the recommended per capita maintenance scenario, approximately 8,000 transit vehicles would need to be purchased over the plan period." This needs to be clarified since we understand it includes regular replacement buses as well as expansion vehicles, yet one could read it as though all these</p>	<p>14. This statement is specifically about MTA and where appropriate the text will be revised for the final draft to make this clear.</p> <p>15. SCAG recognizes that transit service must serve the dependent but would like to also focus on the discretionary rider to help improve mobility.</p> <p>16. SCAG has not to date taken a position on an alternative fuels standard for transit vehicles. The Transportation and Communications Committee was concerned that the SCAQMD and ARB rules would have negative economic impacts on the local cities. SCAG realizes the importance of clean fuels but does not want to interfere with the ability of local operators to deliver public transit.</p> <p>17. Comment noted. Comment will be considered for incorporation into the final RTP as appropriate.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>18. Figure 5.4 shows no increase in ridership for local bus ridership between 1997 and 2025. As your chart shows, the vast majority of ridership is now on local buses and we believe that will continue to be the case. Further, our ridership is increasing about 5% annually and we believe that to be a number consistent with other LA County operators.</p> <p>19. In your recommended investments section you reference rapid bus, circulators, shuttles and commuter rail but do not discuss local bus service which is the backbone of the entire transit system. This needs to be addressed.</p> <p>20. We disagree with your contention that local bus service's chief role is to feed major transit corridor and rail lines. The local service itself meets the needs of most of our riders, although others do not use our service to transfer to express bus or rail lines.</p> <p>21. We believe the way you have presented your information on mode split of costs for Capital and O&amp;M costs in Figure 6.2 and 6.3 and the text is misleading. First, we believe you have undercounted the highway costs. Your footnote "g" says only major arterial and collector expenditures are included. Yet in the City of Long Beach 73% of all roadways (including</p> <p>18. Comment noted. Comment will be considered for incorporation into the final RTP as appropriate.</p> <p>19. SCAG agrees that the local bus network is the backbone of the transit system and this will be conveyed in the text. Staff will clarify that it is important for the local system, tier 2, to support the rail system and the major transit corridors.</p> <p>20. Comment answered above.</p> <p>21. See Response to bullet 1 above.</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>freeways) are local streets, which are not being counted. This is likely a similar ratio for other cities. This means significant highway costs are not being reflected. Further, it should be clearly stated that the high transit cost is due to MTA's rail, rapid bus and consent decree expenditures. Capital costs should be split out from OM costs for comparison. The benefits of the rail will be seen for years into the future, so it should not be discounted. Existing rail lines are well-used with the Blue Line requiring addition of three-car trains to meet demand.</p> <p>22. Appendix D – Transit – Pg. D-2 – It is unfortunate that you only use data through 1998 since transit ridership has increased since then and the trend would become more evident.</p> <p>23. Appendix F – Finance – Pg. F-23 – Section 5309 revenues are not just for fixed guideway bus and rail. They are for all bus and rail.</p> <p>24. Appendix F- Pg. F-40 – Again, we believe the mode split needs to be reviewed and clarified. Local streets (73% of all streets and freeways in Long Beach) are not included in your costs.</p> <p>25. Appendix F – Pg. F-56 – Item r – What is the purpose in your proposed change to allocate the \$186 million solely by population?</p> <p>26.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>Douglas Kim, AICP Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority One Gateway Plaza, MS 99-23-2 Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952 (213) 922-2817 (phone) (213) 922-2849 (fax) <a href="mailto:kimd@mta.net">kimd@mta.net</a></p> <p>ADDRESS RESPONSE TO James L. de la Loza Executive Officer Countywide Planning and Development One Gateway Plaza Los Angeles, CA 90012-2952 213/922-2849 – fax</p>	<p>Appendix F – Page F-61 – 3<sup>rd</sup> Paragraph – Particularly if alternative fuels are mandated, such as the public transit buses, they shouldn't receive tax breaks. SCAG is correct to establish a comparable fuel tax on all types of fuels.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>	<p><b>1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 18, 19, 22, 23 –</b> Comment noted. SCAG staff has worked closely with LACMTA staff in an attempt to achieve consistency between the RTP and the LRTP. (Please note that in its comments on the Draft RTP, MTA is incorrectly comparing its own projected plan and baseline costs, which are in current dollars, with SCAG's costs, which are expressed in constant 1997 dollars.)</p> <p>We strongly believe that consistency between the MTA's Draft LRTP and the RTP is vital to our region's ability to respond effectively to our transportation challenges. As such, we were very pleased that SCAG staff committed to revise its RTP to incorporate all of the LRTP's constrained plan projects at our joint meeting on March 13, 2001. Our constrained plan represents \$11.2 billion in priorities that were developed through a consensus-building process involving local, subregional, and county stakeholders throughout LA County. Since each program represents a priority that MTA intends to program and fund, it is paramount that each be included in SCAG's RTP and assure their eligibility for federal funds. We have attached the Draft LRTP's Executive Summary and delineated the programs from our constrained plan.</p> <p><b>2.</b> We are committed to working with SCAG to revise the modeling for the RTP to accurately incorporate all of our LRTP's constrained plan projects. Based on SCAG's draft conformity determination for the RTP, we believe that LA County's new mix of programs will enhance our region's ability to meet all of its air quality conformity requirements. This includes meeting</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>our emissions budgets, showing financial constraint, and assuring timely implementation of transportation control measures (TCMs).</p> <p>3. See bullet 1 above.</p> <p>The RTP notes that baseline costs include those in the FY 2000/06 RTIP. Please note that MTA's financial models do not include funds that do not pass through the MTA. While this results in an apparent discrepancy between baseline costs for the RTP and our LRTP, it does not result in a difference in the actual funding available to Los Angeles County.</p> <p><b><u>Highway Programs</u></b></p> <p>4. See bullet 1 above.</p> <p>The HOV projects in Los Angeles County listed on page 61 should be replaced by the LRTP's more comprehensive HOV proposals (HOV lanes on I-5 from Rt. 134 to Rt.170, Rt. 14 from Pearblossom to Avenue L, and on I-405 from Rt. 101 to Burbank Blvd). Since the I-5 project (SR-19 to I-710) was not included in the 1998 RTP, it is unclear why it is included in the Draft RTP. This project is the last phase to be completed of the I-5 Ultimate project and can only be built upon the completion of the I-5 Ultimate project from the Orange County Line to Rosemead Blvd. (SR-19).</p> <p>5. While the Draft RTP does not include any HOV connectors in LA County, the LRTP proposes HOV connectors that must be included in the revised RTP.</p>		

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>6. While the Draft RTP does not include interchanges in LA County, the LRTP proposes a number of interchanges along the I-5 and at the 57/60 that must be included in the revised RTP.</p> <p>7. The Draft RTP includes two mixed-flow projects in LA County in the baseline. It is unclear how mixed-flow projects in the absence of HOV facilities can be proposed in light of strict air quality conformity regulations regarding capacity-enhancing projects. We believe that these projects should only be considered if additional resources are still available after all LRTP priorities have been incorporated into the RTP.</p> <p>8. It is not clear that the RTP incorporates the local matching funds (approximately \$2.2 billion) that are necessary to fully fund highway projects recommended in the Traffic Congestion Relief Program. We will work with SCAG staff to ensure that these baseline projects are fully funded, consistent with LRTP assumptions.</p>	<p>6. See bullet 1 above.</p> <p>7. See bullet 1 above.</p> <p>8. See bullet 1 above.</p> <p><b>Transit</b></p> <p>9. We are pleased that SCAG staff is working with us to incorporate all of our LRTP's constrained transit priorities into the RTP to address LA County's congestion challenges. We believe</p>

<b>ORG.</b>	<b>NAME, ORGANIZATION &amp; ADDRESS</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b> <b>SCAG RESPONSE</b> <b>RTP</b>
		<p>that our innovative plans for rapid bus and/or articulated vehicles can substantially improve transit service in a cost-effective manner and help SCAG demonstrate conformity with federal air quality regulations.</p> <p>10. While MTA plans to commit \$3.77 billion to help expand the countywide bus fleet by 1,100 to a total of 4,400 buses, we were unable to directly compare SCAG's financial commitment to transit growth. We recommend that the Final RTP specifically break out the financial commitment for major elements of the transit strategy.</p> <p>11. We believe our coordination with SCAG to incorporate our LRTP's transit programs will eliminate the current discrepancies in transit performance. For example, SCAG proposes to maintain per capita ridership in 2025 of 34.9 trips per person per year, with no increase in route miles for local bus service (page 41) and a 6% increase in express bus service through 2025. In comparison, MTA's LRTP proposes to increase transit mode share by 4.9% over 2025 baseline conditions and 6.3% over 1998 conditions, while increasing revenue vehicle hours by 177% and revenue seat hours by 235%. We believe that SCAG's transit goals should match those of the MTA's within LA County.</p> <p>12. The RTP's transit corridor baseline should be consistent with the MTA's baseline corridors.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>Further, the baseline should only include two Rapid Bus corridors (Wilshire/Whitter and Ventura).</p> <p>13. The Rapid Bus discussion in Chapter V needs to be revised to reflect the MTA's commitment to develop 22 additional lines. The details are included in the attached LRTP and we will work with SCAG to ensure the program benefits of Rapid Bus are accurately modeled and reflected in the RTP.</p> <p>14. The RTP constrained element appears to omit the Crenshaw transit corridor (this is different than the Crenshaw Rapid Bus program that you have included in the constrained RTP). We have proposed \$346.1 million to develop this transit corridor and ask that SCAG explicitly include this in the RTP.</p> <p>15. The RTP needs to include funding for additional work on extending the Exposition transit corridor from its terminus as a baseline project to the City of Santa Monica. MTA has earmarked \$155.2 million in the LRTP for this additional work and recommends that this be included in the RTP's constrained transit corridor investments.</p> <p>16. While the MTA proposes \$580 million to support Metrolink expansion in its Draft LRTP, the RTP is unclear about the investment from</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  <b><u>Other Programs</u></b>	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	LA County for Metrolink. Of the \$1.1 billion assumed for regional Metrolink improvements, please ensure the LA County contribution is consistent with MTA's projection.	<p>17. While we believe that goods movement is a significant mobility issue for Los Angeles County, we are concerned that further study is needed of this issue before truck lanes are recommended. We will continue to work with SCAG to ensure that goods movement is examined in Los Angeles County in a systematic manner, considering a full range of goods movement strategies including alternative freight system management options.</p> <p>Committing funds to truck lane projects in the RTP should occur only after all of MTA's LRTP constrained plan is fully integrated into the RTP.</p> <p>18. While MTA has proposed \$722 million in grade crossing projects for LA County, including the Alameda Corridor East and Gateway Cities regions, SCAG's commitment to each of these projects is unclear. The RTP should be revised to clarify that its commitment matches that of MTA's Draft LRTP for each of these two major rail corridors.</p> <p>19. The RTP appears to allocate \$1.4 billion in arterial improvements throughout LA County, a commitment that falls short of MTA's proposal</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>to allocate \$1.75 billion towards these important programs. This includes \$817 million for regional surface transportation improvements and \$929 million for transportation signal synchronization and bus speed improvements. MTA believes the RTP's commitment should match the LRTP's proposal.</p> <p>20. The RTP does not appear to include the retrofit soundwall program or identify funding for these important improvements along current HOV facilities. The MTA has proposed a significant commitment of \$549.2 million to accommodate a portion of the total need for new soundwalls and urges SCAG to ensure this commitment is included in the constrained RTP</p> <p>21. The RTP proposes \$250 million for "investment in highway/arterial O&amp;M", but has not clearly identified what funding is available for this investment. The RTP should clarify if these are SHOPP funds or funds from other sources.</p> <p>22. The RTP's financial commitment to transportation demand management (TDM) is unclear. While the Draft LRTP commits over \$850 million for TDM (\$301.9 million for the regional rideshare program and \$260.4 million for countywide TDM programs), the RTP is vague about financial commitments. We urge SCAG to revise the RTP to match the MTA's commitment in LA County.</p> <p>SCAG recognizes that soundwalls are an important mitigation element for highway noise, and the Final RTP addresses this importance. The cost projections of all new projects that will require soundwalls include the cost of building those soundwalls. See also mitigation measures for highway noise in the 2001 RTP PEIR.</p> <p>The RTP assumes SHOPP funds would offset highway operation and maintenance expenditures.</p> <p>See bullet 1 above.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>23.</p> <p>The RTP's financial commitment to non-motorized transportation falls short of the MTA's proposed \$644.8 million (\$324.8 million for pedestrian programs and transportation enhancements and \$320 million for bicycle programs). We believe the RTP should match this financial commitment.</p>	<p>23.</p> <p>See bullet 1 above.</p>
Los Angeles World Airports	<p>Jim Ritchie Deputy Executive Director Los Angeles World Airports 1 World Way P. O. Box 92216 Los Angeles, CA 90009-2216 310/646-5252 310/646-0523 <a href="http://www.lawa.org">www.lawa.org</a></p>	<p><b>Modeling and Forecasting</b></p> <p>See Response to Letter L9 in Response to Comments, Final PEIR Addendum, April 2001.</p> <p>1.</p> <p>The RADAM and transportation models used in the RTP are the cornerstones of many of the analytical results. However, the document does not provide sufficient technical information regarding these models to allow meaningful comments. For instance, although the roadway traffic model is referenced in the draft reports the 1997 Model Validation and Summary Report, this document is not included for review. We are concerned about the fundamental assumptions made in these models, and how these assumptions affected the output of the planning models, particularly the conclusions reached regarding the redistribution of passengers among the airports in the region. We believe that the passenger levels resulting from the redistribution of regional demand among airports may be unrealistic because (1) the fundamental assumption regarding unconstrained passenger behavior are at odds with most accepted models and real-world experience. (2) there exists no authority to impose or provide the "Incentive Packages" apparently responsible for the redistribution nor any experience to suggest they will work, and (3) federal law effectively bars SCAG, local</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>governments and airport proprietors from restricting the access and use of existing airport facilities. We request details on the input assumptions associated with the report's modeling efforts along with both raw model outputs and any post-processing of the original model results in order to provide a complete review.</p> <p>2. We understand from SCAG staff that some of the airport demands assumed in the analysis would be reached well in advance of the 2025 horizon year. In fact, it is assumed in the analysis that LAX would reach its capacity in each scenario by 2015. It is doubtful that the demand at any airport, particularly LAX, will remain stagnant between 2015 and 2025. Because of the very complex and interwoven nature of region air traffic demand, it is likely that there would be substantial changes in passenger characteristics between 2015 and 2025. This does not seem to be considered in the analysis.</p> <p>3. We are unsure of the basis used for aircraft fleet mix forecasts. Also, the analysis was not done on an airport-by-airport basis. More information is needed about the base line fleet mix information and about the projected changes within the forecast. This is particularly important given the long-range nature of the forecast horizon.</p> <p>4.</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>Your use of the RADAM for cargo demand redistribution is a new use of the model. Your methodology is stated as both similar to and dependent on the results of the passenger module of the model. The necessary information needed to understand the weighting of the primary input parameters is not discussed in the documentation. Further, the discussion does not indicate how the model addresses the cost component of cargo redistribution as a marginal change to the current system. In addition to this detailed input information, we would need to see the sensitivity testing associated with each model variable to assess the statistical accuracy of the results.</p> <p>5. The document assumes that air passengers will be redistributed through the use of a high-speed rail system connecting regional airports, resulting in positive environmental effects in the region. Even if this highly speculative system is every built, the theory that a high speed rail system to airports would result in a redistribution of regional air traffic is highly suspect. The theory that high-speed rail is able to affect regional air traffic demand in an unregulated airline industry is unproven and has no justifiable technical support. In fact, high-speed rail may result in exactly the opposite result of that assumed in the PEIR, with more demand attracted to close-in airports, rather than outlying airports. This puts many of the results of the PEIR in question.</p> <p>6.</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>In the cargo study, one of the founding assumptions of the RADAM analysis states that a high speed rail system would be used as a means of redistributing cargo as well as passengers to regional airports. Rail transportation of any sort is not a compatible mode with the private distribution network that fuels air cargo. The cost structure of the air freight forwarding industry is based on very narrow margins and long-term relationships between shippers, forwarders and carriers. No mention is made in the plan about the motivation or the means of such a fundamental shift in the way that air cargo is distributed. The use of this assumption without further analysis calls the results of the modeling into question.</p> <p>7. The SCAG staff evaluation of the environmental impacts of the aviation scenarios appears to be based on the hypothesized <u>unmitigated</u> environmental impacts of the expansion and/or build-out of different airports. This is misleading and inaccurate since it does not take into account any of the very extensive ground transportation improvements to the existing infrastructure surrounding the airport that the Draft EIS/EIR for the LAX Master Plan evaluates and recommends – mitigation measures that, if approved by the City Council, will greatly reduce any LAX master plan-related noise, air quality and transportation impacts.</p> <p>8. The report acknowledges that under Scenario 2, with LAX constrained at 70 MAP, higher</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>airfares would likely result at all of the region's airports, which in turn would impact passenger demand and allocation. However, the report states that the SCAG Aviation Task Force directed that this issue not be addressed. The assumption that increased airfare would have no effect on passenger allocations is faulty and puts the projections for Scenario 2 into doubt. The projections for the other scenarios are questionable as well, as this same assumption was used for each.</p> <p>9. We believe that SCAG may be exceeding its legal authority when it proposes an aviation scenario such as Scenario 8 that is based on a hypothetical high speed rail system that does not appear to have either economic or technical feasibility within the pertinent timeframe, and that purports to "cap" LAX to an air service level of only 78 MAP. In fact, references to airport "caps" in the aviation scenarios should be eliminated, since federal law prohibits airport proprietors and local and state agencies from imposing constraints on levels of airport use. Consequently, an appropriate forecasting model would assume unconstrained performance of a system and then determine how to mitigate those consequences.</p> <p>10. Scenario 8 assumes dramatic growth at both Ontario International Airport and at El Toro Airport in Orange County. Each airport is projected to carry almost 30 MAP, roughly the size of Phoenix Sky Harbor today. In addition,</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>the PEIR assumes that John Wayne Airport will operate near capacity, with 8.4 MAP. In contrast, LAWA's forecasts indicate that there is an inverse relationship between the size of ONT and the size of the El Toro/John Wayne airports. If left unconstrained, these airports' catchment areas would significantly overlap, and would likely encompass the nearby San Bernardino catchment area. Simply stated, these airports would attract many of the same passengers. A large El Toro/John Wayne airport system would reduce future demand and growth away from ONT and vice versa. As a result, it is very unlikely that both ONT and El Toro could attract close to 30 MAP, regardless of the demand at other regional airports.</p>	<p>11. While various studies of a commercial airport at El Toro have been undertaken in recent history, Ontario has never been assessed or planned to the level suggested in Scenario 8. A 30 MAP airport is a significant airport with significant impacts on the surrounding environment. No mention is made of the need for a plan at Ontario that could support this level of traffic or how the impacts of such an expansion would be mitigated. In addition, the unconstrained 2020 demand scenario for ONT is only 16.6 MAP, while Scenario 8 put ONT in 2020 at almost 30 MAP. It is unreasonable to assume that a high speed rail system could induce over 13 MAP of additional growth at Ontario airport – at the same time that El Toro/John Wayne airports are capturing much of the regional demand for air service.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>12. The RTP EIR appears to use EMFAC7G for calculating traffic emissions rather than the more up-to-date EMFAC2000, which uses higher emission factors. We request further information as to your assumptions and analysis.</p> <p>13. The environmental analysis of Scenario 8 and others seems to be based on the assumption that a high speed rail system will be built and operating by the year 2020. For example, an undated SCAG memo states that Scenario 8 would have the lowest vehicle-hours traveled and least delays of the alternatives, but this conclusion assumes a fully functional high speed rail system. It is important to know what the environmental impacts of Scenario 8 would be if the high speed rail system were not built.</p> <p>14. The report assumes that the constraining factor at LAX is runway capacity, which would result in unacceptable delays when the airport reaches 78 MAP. This assumption is questioned in light of the fact that the Draft EIS/EIR of the LAX Master Plan found that the current airport configuration would ultimately be constrained by the combination of a balanced airside, terminal and landside system within the operational limits of the design day and peak hour scheduling and fleet mix patterns of the airlines that serve the airport. The RTP used a less sophisticated approach to calculating capacity using the RADAM model. Further, as stated previously in our comments, no details are</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>offered in the RTP as to the aircraft fleet mix assumptions and load factor assumptions used to convert aircraft operations into an annual passenger capacity of a runway system.</p> <p>15. The future projected emissions show little growth at LAX and tremendous growth for ONT and Palmdale Airport (PMD). As written, the RTP projects only a small increase at LAX for VOC, NOx, Sox and PM10, despite the growth of passenger demand. The FAA may not approve controls to regulate these respective allocations of growth.</p> <p>16. It is unclear why VOC levels at PMD are projected to increase minimally despite the tremendous growth that is projected to take place.</p> <p>17. As with criteria pollutants, these emissions should correspond to growth in passenger demand.</p> <p>18. We believe that the INM generally falls short in depicting actual noise levels at Ontario International Airport. From our experience, the INM under predicts noise by as much monitors. Because of this, the noise contours are actually much greater than those depicted in the RTP. For the amount of growth the RTP is projecting for Ontario International Airport, this means that a far greater area will be impacted than is shown</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE
ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	RTP
Morongo Band of Mission	Antonio Salazar-Hobson Attorney-At-Law 94-A Uranus Terrace	<p>19. On Pages ES-3 and PD-16, the report states that the proposed extension of the Green Line will terminate at Century and Sepulveda Boulevards. Considering that no decision has been made regarding the exact location of the terminus of this light rail line, it may be more appropriate to state that the Green Line will extend to LAX.</p> <p>20. On Page VC-38, the draft RTP states that “Limited expansion at LAX could impact the visual character and setting of the area with increases in congestion and traffic due to increased services.” It is not necessarily true that traffic congestion will worsen with an increase in services at LAX. In our proposal to handle the anticipated future demand at LAX, Los Angeles World Airports is proposing extensive improvements to the ground transportation system to improve traffic flow in the LAX area.</p> <p>21. On Page K-45 of Technical Appendix K, please verify the description of the Baseline Project for SR-1 currently listed as “From Imperial Hwy to Century Blvd restriping add/widen ramp lanes and upgrade lighting, widen from 6 to 12 lanes.”</p>	<p>1, 2. The Morongo Intermodal Transload and Industrial Center (MITIC) appears to support the need for new domestic intermodal terminals in the Inland Empire.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Indians	San Francisco, CA 94114 415/834-1004 415/431-7507 – fax	<p>transportation project that strongly supports and reinforces the goals of SCAG's Draft 2001 RTP.</p> <p>2. The Draft 2001 RTP cites the need for facilities such as MITIC (Page 84), and is clearly supportive of this and other goals and objectives articulated in the Draft 2001 RTP.</p> <p>3. The 2001 RTP includes specific mention of MITIC as being exemplary of the kind of intermodal freight facility referenced above.</p> <p>4. The constrained project list in the adopted 2001 RTP include necessary funding for the public infrastructure that will be required in the Cabazon area.</p> <p>5. MITIC is strongly supported by the Davis Administration, the Riverside County Transportation Commission and Riverside County, <i>inter alia</i>. By closing the circle connecting transportation and goods movement with environmental justice, economic development, education and energy efficiency, MITIC will stand as a stunning achievement in support of the RTP's goals.</p> <p>3. Suggested editorial changes will be considered for inclusion in the final plan.</p> <p>4. This project is included in the final plan.</p> <p>5. Comment linking MITIC with a number of the RTP's goals is noted.</p>
OnTrac	Mr. Christopher Becker Executive Director OnTrac 8040 Saturn Street, Suite 201 Brea, CA 92821-6274	<p>1. Our project was included in the Final 2000 RTP. We would like to be assured that our project is included in the 2001 RTP.</p> <p>1. The 2000 RTIP is part of the baseline for the 2001 RTP. Therefore, your project is counted as a baseline project in the 2001 RTP.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Orange County Transportation Authority	714/577-5819 714/577-5822 - fax	<p>1. I would like to request that the I-5 North widening (1 mixed flow lane in each direction from SR-91 to the LA County Line) be included in the baseline RTP level. It will be funded with available Measure M.</p> <p>2. OCTA has reviewed the Southern California Association of Governments Draft 2001 RTP and supports the overall strategy.</p> <p>3. OCTA supports strategies to improve bus transit service.</p> <p>4. OCTA is requesting these corridors be recognized in the RTP as bus rapid transit corridors for further analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>## Beach Boulevard from the future Buena Park train station to Pacific Coast Highway.</li> <li>## Katella Avenue from the I-605 to Harbor Boulevard</li> <li>## Westminster Avenue from the Los Angeles County line to Bristol Street</li> <li>## Warner Avenue from Beach Boulevard to Bristol Street</li> </ul> <p>5. While numerous heavy rail corridors are</p> <p>1. I-5 widening from SR-91 to LA County has been moved into the baseline.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>4. Beach Boulevard and Katella Avenue are in the constrained plan while Westminster Avenue and Warner Avenue are in the long-range plan.</p> <p>5. California-Nevada rail link will be added to the Long-Range Corridors table on</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>6. In reviewing the RTP project list, it is unclear whether all improvements included in the Four Corners preferred strategy are included in the Draft 2001 RTP. For example, recommended toll lanes on SR-71 and toll to toll connections between SR-91 and SR-71 do not appear on Exh. 5.5. OCTA is requesting SCAG review the Four Corners strategy and ensure all improvements are included in the RTP.</p> <p>7. While OCTA recognizes the region faces significant funding constraints over the next 25 years, assumptions that local sales tax measures will be extended are questionable since they presently require a two-thirds majority vote. OCTA did not assume these revenues in developing its RTP project nominations and is proposing a more conservative approach, or a range of funding scenarios, be used.</p> <p>8. Technical Corrections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>## Pg. 46, 1<sup>st</sup> parag. Add "Lanes" as follows: SR-91 Express Lanes, Orange County</li> <li>## Exh. 5.5 – correct – continuous auxiliary lanes on SR-57 are proposed for these links:</li> <li>## SR-57 northbound – full corridor</li> </ul> <p>6. Recommendations from the Four Corners study were considered in developing the 2001 RTP, and some elements were incorporated into the RTP.</p> <p>7. SCAG staff has been working with OCTA staff to ensure that the revised financial assumptions reflect OCTA's concerns. Accordingly, SCAG does not assume extension of Measure M to support RTP projects.</p> <p>8, 9, 10, 11 Suggested revisions were incorporated in the final RTP as appropriate.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>9. Pg. 61, table 5.5 – HOV Connector Projects        # The SR-22 West Orange County Connection includes the following HOV connectors: SR-22/I-5, SR-22/SR-55, SR-22/I-5 and I-405/I-605 - These projects have moved beyond Project Study Report State and are currently in the environmental review state. Please change table 5.5, last column from “PSR Needed” to “In Environmental” to reflect this status.</p> <p>10. Page 79 – Table 5.15        # Add “Orange-Olive” Grade Crossings to the table.</p> <p>11. Page 136 and Exh. 8.1 – Long Range Corridors        It is unclear what SR-142 (Carbon Canyon Road) improvements are being referenced. This corridor was analyzed in the Four Corners Study and was not recommended for further study. The recommendation was to conduct a feasibility/alignment study for a new corridor in the Tonner Canyon area.</p>	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
COMMENTS		
Port of Long Beach	Robert Kanter, Ph.D. Director of Planning The Port of Long Beach P.O. Box 570 Long Beach, CA 909601-0570 562/437-0041 562/901-1725	<p>1. The regional transportation plan must be fiscally constrained. In addition, fund availability is constrained by county. Appropriate funding that could be potentially needed to address the goods movement issues on I-710 cannot be accommodated within this plan due to competing needs and limited availability of funds within the county of Los Angeles. This corridor is identified as a study corridor to simply acknowledge the need to address the goods movement issue in this corridor in the long run. On the other hand, the proposed truck lanes on I-15 lies completely in the counties of San Bernardino and Riverside. Both of these counties have identified funding in the current plan to address the goods movement issues on this corridor although additional studies would be needed to further refine the corridor improvement needs and their feasibility.</p> <p>2. Strategic Arterial Improvements: Why are no projects identified in Los Angeles County?</p> <p>3. Recommended Goods Movement Investments: The Port of Long Beach and several other Goods Movement Advisory Committee members had previously requested the I-710 Corridor (from the Ports to SR 60) be added to the list of priorities.</p> <p>4. Hueneme, Long Beach and Los Angeles Seaports: The Port of Long Beach is currently planning to construct two regionally significant projects in the next four years: The Gerald Desmond Bridge widening project and the</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
COMMENTS		
	<p>Terminal Island Freeway/Ocean Boulevard Interchange, both of which are in the SCAG RTIP. An ITS project is proposed but not fully funded and approved. The Port does not have the funds at this time for additional regional roadway and freeway projects, which is contrary to what is implied in this section. Hence, the Port will be seeking public funding for future proposed projects. The Ports cannot bear the entire burden of constructing regionally significant transportation improvements, such as I-710 improvements.</p> <p>5. Inland Ports and Intermodal Terminals: Firstly, it is unclear if the “Inland Port” concept is an actual RTP project, or merely recommended for further study. The inland port should not be an RTP project because such a concept is not considered to be viable for the movement of international containers, or effective in congestion reduction for several reasons.</p>	<p>The inland port is not an RTP project at this time. The RTP recommends studying the feasibility of the inland port concept as indicated in the first Action item on page 86 of the Draft RTP.</p> <p>Regarding the viability of moving international containers via an inland port, the shippers, railroads, steamship lines, and intermodal marketing companies may not even want to move these small number of boxes via rail because it is probably not economical (i.e., it is probably more cost-effective to dray the containers given current market conditions). Notwithstanding the economical viability, it may not be practical for the railroads to run shuttle trains along the Alameda Corridor. Moreover, the Alameda Corridor and the</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>Ports' on-dock railyards most likely do not have the capacity to handle these additional containers.</p> <p>Regarding the congestion reduction effects, the number of truck movements and containers with origins/destinations in the Inland Empire is nominal, based upon detailed origin destination surveys conducted by the Ports of Long Beach/Los Angeles for the Ports Transportation Master Plan. The minimal number of truck trips that would be reduced on area freeways (I-710, and SR 60) by an inland port project under existing and future conditions would nominally improve operating conditions. Hence, this type of project would not be cost-effective. Furthermore, given that an inland port is entirely functionally and financially dependent upon private industry, and no feasibility studies have been conducted, it is inappropriate to identify this project as a RTP project. The inland port concept needs to be studied much more comprehensively and broadly, and involving all entities of the supply chain. The inland port concept may be more viable for domestic freight.</p>	<p>6. Post 2025 Long-Range Corridors: The I-710 should be included in the Southwest Passage, in addition or in place of I-110. The I-710 is the primary Ports access freeway, not I-110. In fact, about 65%-70% of the trucks access the Port via I-710.</p> <p>6. We agree and the Plan has been modified.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
COMMENTS		
<p>Port of Los Angeles</p> <p>Bruce Seaton Chief Operating Officer Port of Los Angeles 425 S. Palos Verdes Street P. O. Box 151 San Pedro, CA 90733-0151 310/732-3857</p>	<p><b>1.</b> <b>Goods Movement</b> – (pg. 9) The focus of the major investments to improve grade crossings and truck lane projects to promote Goods Movement on SR-60 and I-15 needs to be expanded to include SR-710.</p> <p><b>2.</b> <b>Task Forces and Key Subcommittees – Goods Movement</b> – (pg. 23) A key issue to add is the need to specifically address Port transportation issues i.e., grade separations, freeway intersections at Port roadways, and extension of the SR-47.</p> <p><b>3.</b> <b>Marine Ports</b> – (pg. 50) – Update tonnage and container counts to the most recent projections provided by the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach.</p> <p>Reference to the use of 1995 data from the Ports is of concern. In 1995 there were no near-dock facilities in operation in the Port of Los Angeles. A projection based on 1995 data would exaggerate the number of truck trips by ignoring the near-dock rail facilities that eliminate drayage truck trips in the region and are a major element in the transportation infrastructure improvements by the Ports.</p> <p><b>4.</b> <b>Recommended Highway and Arterial Improvements</b> – (pg. 59)-Should identify the</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
COMMENTS		
<p><b>5.</b> Ports, Rail, and Trucks – (pg. 76) – In addition to improving grade crossings and truck lane projects, RTP funding is necessary to improve transportation infrastructure in and around the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach. The ports' cargo is forecasted to triple by the year 2025. This projected volume of cargo will exceed and overwhelm the current capacities of the ports' transportation infrastructure. RTP funded projects are necessary to construct freeway intersections on major port roadways, increase the capacity of the I-710, extend the SR-47 to the I-405, grade separate rail from the West Basin at Neptune Avenue and Henry Ford Avenue, install Advance Traveler Information Systems (ATIS) and Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS).</p> <p><b>5.</b> The RTP does not fund projects. The RTP incorporates projects for which funding has been partly or wholly committed (baseline or RTIP projects) and funding sources have been identified (constrained projects). For local projects, it is up to the local agencies to target and obtain funds.</p>		<p><b>6.</b> (Pg. 76, 78) – There appears to be a discrepancy in the increased good movement volume. On page 76 the trade volume is expected to double and result in increased goods movement cargo of 30 percent. On page 78, the heavy-duty truck traffic is anticipated to increase 60 percent. An explanation of how these figures are, or are not, related should be included.</p> <p><b>6.</b> The trade volume percentage on page 76 refers to international and domestic goods movement traffic <i>for all modes</i>. The volume percentage cited on page 78 covers heavy-duty trucks only.</p> <p><b>7.</b> It appears that the benefits of the Alameda Corridor Project (pg. 82) still have not been quantified for air quality or congestion. SCAG</p> <p><b>7.</b> SCAG incorporated the Alameda Corridor Project into its plans and forecasts along with the regional job impacts associated with San Pedro Bay's cargo activities. Therefore, port projects aimed at accommodating cargo growth that</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	should be able to clearly demonstrate the benefits of this major project in the RTP.	supports the development of the Alameda Corridor are consistent with SCAG's plans and regional growth forecasts, which were used in the development of the 1997 State Implementation Plans.
<b>8. Hueneme, Long Beach, and Los Angeles Seaports</b> – (page 84) The statement “international and domestic cargo volumes are forecasted to double by 2025” is too low. Both the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles forecast a tripling of cargo volumes by the year 2020.	Reference to cargo growth has been revised per comment.	9. The third action item on the referenced page in the RTP (page 85) calls for supporting the subregions in obtaining funding for port area landside access studies. This includes supporting efforts by the Gateway Cities and South Bay Councils of Governments in obtaining state and federal funding for port-related projects.
	9. <b>Action</b> – (pg. 85) – The action items should be modified to reflect efforts to secure <u>state</u> and <u>federal funding</u> for port area landside access studies and projects.	10. <b>Inland Ports and Inland Intermodal Terminals</b> – (pg. 85) – If inland ports can solely operate with rail haul options, this is worth consideration. Truck drayage of cargo to inland ports and inland intermodal terminals will increase truck traffic on already crowded freeways. Demurrage and double handling will increase delivery times of goods to customers.
		11. <b>CONFORMITY</b> – A major consideration in gaining approvals for Port development is the determination of conformity with the Clean Air Act. For regions with EPA-approved SIPs there are a number of options for determining See response to bullet #7.

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>In as much as the SIP is based on emission estimates established through growth projected by the MPO (SCAG), it is important that Port development, which is a reflection of growth, be included in the RTP. For the most part, Port development improves transportation efficiencies relative to a no-project scenario and also has resultant air quality benefits. This can be achieved through deeper channels resulting in relatively fewer but larger ships, less truck idling through improved backland facilities, less truck trips through near-dock intermodal facilities and road improvements, including grade separations.</p> <p>12.</p> <p>The RTP should be developed so that future Port activities, subject to federal action, can be found to be in conformance with the Clean Air Act.</p> <p>The ports are developing more on dock and near dock intermodal terminals. Unit trains leaving port complexes provide the quickest delivery of goods to customers with the least impact on surface transportation infrastructure. The ports, shipping lines, terminal operators, labor, truckers, and warehousing will have to fully embrace technology and change their methods of operation to handle the projected cargo.</p> <p><b>Technical Appendix E – Goods Movement</b></p>	<p>Inland terminals – (pg. E-5) – The Ports should conformity. Two of these are pertinent to SCAG and the RTP.</p> <p>12. See response to bullet #7.</p> <p>13. Inland terminals – (pg. E-5) – The Ports should Comment noted. Optimization of existing port terminal space is recognized as</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>first optimize the use of existing terminal space before the inland terminals concept is adopted.</p> <p><b>14.</b> <b>Off-peak hours</b> – (pg. E-22) – Expansion of hours of operation must be done with the recognition that the Port terminals are only half of the equation. The bigger issue is keeping the delivery sites and cargo distribution facilities open to receive off-peak hour deliveries.</p> <p><b>15.</b> <b>Intermodal rail</b> – (pg. E-23) – Still is not clear how, or even if, SCAG has calculated the emission and credit benefits of on-dock and near-dock rail facilities. Supporting their creation and infrastructure doesn't mean much for SIP and conformity purposes if they are never counted.</p>	<p>part of the solution to accommodating cargo growth. The Goods Movement Advisory Committee acknowledges this in their matrix of issues, problems and potential solutions on page E-23 (bullets 1, 4, and 5 under Growth of Port Traffic/Potential Solutions).</p> <p>Comment noted. Extending hours of operation involves coordination with unions, freight forwarders and consolidators, warehouses, and distribution centers as well as port terminals. The Goods Movement Advisory Committee acknowledges this in their matrix of issues, problems and potential solutions on pages E-23 and E-24 (bullet 1 under Growth of Port Traffic/Potential Solutions, and bullet 8 under Land-side Access/Potential Solutions).</p> <p>Comment noted. The port's on-dock and near-dock rail facilities are accounted for in SCAG's Heavy Duty Truck Model that is used for estimating trips and air emissions. Specifically, the port provided SCAG in April, 1998 with estimates of 1997 truck trips that reflected the following allocations of intermodal cargo: 20% Pier 300; 20% TICTF; 40% ICTF; 20% ELA/Hobart. Total container throughput was reduced accordingly (based on the port's assumption that intermodal containers represented 50 percent of total container throughput) and then converted to truck trips for modeling purposes.</p>	
<p>Riverside County Transportation Commission</p>	<p>Eric Haley Executive Director Riverside County Transportation Commission 3560 University Avenue, Ste. 100 Riverside, CA 92501 909/787-7141 909/787-7920 – fax <a href="http://www.rctc.org">www.rctc.org</a></p>	<p>1-3.</p> <p>The final RTP does not specify toll lanes on the SR-91. Rather, the RTP recognizes the SR-91 simply as a corridor in need of capacity improvements.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	areas currently being studied, and will submit specific projects within each corridor for inclusion in the next TRP update.	<p>2. We are requesting that SCAG remove the toll lane extension on SR91 to I-15. It is imperative that the designation of the toll lane extension to the I-15 be removed, as it can be misconstrued as an RCTC position of support for this project.</p> <p>3. We agree however, with the 91 corridor being shown as a capacity enhancement or lane addition from I-15 to the Orange County line instead of a toll extension.</p>
South Coast Air Quality Management District	Barry R. Wallerstein, D.Env. Executive Officer South Coast Air Quality Management District 21865 E. Copley Drive Diamond Bar, CA 91705-4182 909/396-2000	<p>1. The Draft RTP identifies several resource-intensive projects for which funding mechanisms have not been specifically identified to support their implementation. The RTP document specifies that emissions reductions will occur from implementation of various projects and strategies. Accordingly, an outline of the implementation milestones, performance indicators and appropriate substitutions and/or backstop measures should be provided to ensure that emission reduction targets are achieved.</p> <p><b>POLICY ISSUES</b></p> <p><i>DRAFT RTP DOCUMENT</i></p> <p>2.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>P. 40 – Applicable SIP (Emission Budgets and TCMs)</p> <p>This section discusses “The March 1999 Court ruling” and it’s mandate, however, the specific case in not mentioned. The District recommends that the RTP document cite the name of the case referenced.</p> <p>3. P. 56 – Strategic Investments</p> <p>In the discussion of the RTP’s Guiding Principles, SCAG staff has not identified the environmental impacts of those principles. The District recommends that impacts be identified along with the appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>4. P. 91 – Transportation Demand Management</p> <p>The District would support an appropriate program that maintains the existing carpool market and would increase the number of carpools if resources could be found. However, the District does not support the recommendation to “consider reinstating Rule 2202 to include employers with less than 250 employees at the work site.” The AQMD does not have the legal authority to extend Rule 2202 requirements to employers with less than 250 employees. These employers were exempted from Rule 2202 by the passage of SB 432 (Lewis) on June 19, 1998.</p> <p>5. P. 136 – Air Quality</p> <p>The RTP states that the analysis that would capture the effects of how emissions travel and</p> <p>Comments noted and revisions will be made accordingly.</p> <p>Comments noted and revisions will be made accordingly. The 2001 RTP PEIR programmatically addresses the goals, policies, and guiding principles of the RTP. Mitigation measures are identified as appropriate.</p> <p>Comments noted and revisions will be made accordingly.</p> <p>As stated in the 2001 RTP, ideally SCAG’s air quality analysis would take into account how emissions travel and disperse throughout the region when subject to weather patterns. However, this type of analysis is not required and is</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>disperse through the region due to weather patterns was not completed at the time the draft document was released. When does SCAG anticipate completion of this analysis? The District will be available to provide assistance in all air quality analysis.</p> <p><b>GENERAL COMMENTS</b></p>	<p>beyond the scope of the current plan and associated programmatic environmental analysis.</p> <p>6. Comment noted.</p> <p>7. The Draft 2001 RTP contains several resource intensive projects (e.g., MAGLEV Demonstration Project and the TDM Projects). The final RTP document should identify funding sources needed for these projects as well as funding for the required infrastructure needed to support these projects.</p> <p>7. SCAG is committed to a certain amount of emission reductions in the SCAB region. Therefore, this plan should identify methods and timeframes to achieve those reductions along with backstop measures to address any potential shortfall.</p> <p>8. References to the 1997 Ozone State Implementation Plan (SIP) should read “the 1997 Ozone SIP as amended in 1999” or “1999 Ozone SIP” (including all appendices, tables and footnotes). Note that the 1999 AQMP amendments did not include mobile source components, therefore, it is acceptable to reference the mobile source portion of the 1997 AQMP.</p> <p>Comments noted and revisions will be made accordingly.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>9. The 2001 RTP relies heavily on the 1998 Plan, therefore, the District recommends that SCAG staff clearly identify each 2001 RTP policy individually, detailing modifications from the 1998 RTP policies. The District appreciates all policies and strategies adopted in the RTP that will encourage and support County Transportation Commissions (CTCs) in their efforts to comply with the recently adopted Clean Fleet rule requirements.</p> <p>10. To date, the Los Angeles Metropolitan Transportation Authority's (LAMTA, which is the largest CTC in the region) project list and analysis has not been incorporated into the RTP. Please identify how this information will affect the final RTP conformity analysis and document.</p>	<p>9. Comments noted. The policies adopted in the 1998 RTP are intact in the 2001 RTP.</p> <p>10. SCAG staff has worked closely with LACMTA staff in an attempt to achieve consistency between the RTP and the LRTP.</p> <p>11. See response to bullet 7 above.</p> <p>11. The conformity analysis assumes emission reductions that are attributed to the MAGLEV Project. Since Phase II funding for the MAGLEV Project was not awarded to the SCAG Region, the emission reductions attributed to this project should be supported with backstop measures for equivalent reductions. Also, in order to maintain the technical integrity of our emissions and air quality modeling, the substitution measures should have similar reduction characteristics and distributions. If the SCAG Region receives funding for the MAGLEV Project for future</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>12. High Speed Rail is anticipated as a major investment for the region, however, the RTP fails to identify a timeframe for funding or completion. The District recommends that this information be provided. The RTP identifies the need for implementing alternative funding strategies to address the financial shortfall and ensure conformity. However, the plan fails to identify a timeline for developing and implementing these strategies. A timeline should be provided in the final RTP document.</p> <p>13. There is a large disparity in the growth rates of heavy-duty VMT and light-duty VMT between Los Angeles &amp; Orange Counties versus the growth projected for Inland Empire. Please explain.</p> <p>12. Comment noted. Please refer to Technical Appendix F for financial information and Technical Appendix G for MAGLEV information.</p> <p>13. The LDV and MDV trips are mostly generated from activities associated with population and households. The HDT trips are generated from number of employment. The distribution of HDT trips is based on employment sectors identified by SIC code data, external trips, and special generators such as seaports and airports.</p> <p>Reasons for a large disparity in the growth rates of heavy-duty VMT and light-duty VMT are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) The growth for the Inland Empire is related to residential growth.</li> <li>(2) The growth for Orange County and LA County are more related to employment growth; and</li> <li>(3) The major special generators for HDT travel are generated from LA County including sea ports and airports. These special generators affect HDT VMT more in LA and Orange Counties than in the Inland Empire.</li> </ul>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
COMMENTS		
14.	<p>The 2001 RTP relies heavily on Transportation Demand Management strategies. The District recommends that the final RTP provide specific funding targets for each TDM strategy in order to more accurately evaluate and determine cost and program effectiveness as well as identify proposed funding sources.</p> <p><b>APPENDIX C – HIGHWAYS &amp; ARTERIALS</b></p>	Comment noted.
15.	<p><b>Table C-3</b> This information shows no additions to VMT on “Major Collectors” between the years 1997 and 2025. This seems unusual. If true, please explain.</p> <p><b>APPENDIX H – TRANSPORTATION CONFORMITY REPORT</b></p>	<p>Table C-3 presents network lane miles for 2025 Plan and 2025 Baseline. This table will be updated in the final RTP.</p> <p>16-20, 22, 26-29 Staff will review and incorporate all of the suggested revisions as appropriate.</p>
16.	<p><b>P. 84, Subsection g – Rule 2020</b> Rule 2020 should be Rule 2202, both in the title and description of the subsection.</p>	
17.	<p><b>P.101 – 1997 Ozone SIP (SCAB)</b> The third sentence references the 1994 Ozone SIP/AQMD...it should read: “1994 Ozone SIP/AQMP.”</p>	
18.	<p><b>P. 102 – Assessment of Timely Implementation</b></p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p><b>19.</b>  <b>P. 103 – Actions that Demonstrate Timely Implementation</b>  This section identifies action items; however, there are no mechanisms to identify how these actions will be achieved or a timeline to accomplish them.</p> <p><b>20.</b>  <b>P. 104 – High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) Improvements</b>  This section does not identify actions that are to be taken that will achieve the goals stated or a timeline to accomplish them.</p> <p><b>21.</b>  <b>P. 104 – Transit/System Management</b>  This section does not identify actions that are to be taken that will achieve the goals stated or a timeline to accomplish them.</p> <p><b>22.</b>  <b>P. 136 – Exhibit D: TCM1 Categories Exempt From the 1997 Ozone SIP/AQMP SCAB</b>  This information is taken from the 1997AQMP – page numbers and their order should be reviewed for accuracy and consistency.</p> <p><b>APPENDIX F – FINANCE</b></p> <p><b>23.</b>  <b>Alternative Fuel Vehicles</b>  The RTP discusses the potential loss of revenues</p> <p>23. Comment concerning the District Board's need to review the issue of alternative</p>		

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>in gasoline taxes over the next 25 years due to the implementation and penetration of alternative fuel vehicles. The District Governing Board has an ongoing policy of seeking grants and other funding sources that will support the alternative fuels programs. The District, based on existing Board policies, will support and participate in future coordination activities with the California Air Resources Board, California Energy Commission and local jurisdictions to establish long-term regional actions that support the use of alternative fuels. However, the District Board will need to review the issue of taxation of alternative fuels as indicated in Appendix F, table 12 prior to establishing a formal position on such a proposal.</p>	<p>fuel taxation has been noted.</p> <p><b>24. P. F-11 – TEA-21</b>  In the second paragraph, the dollar amounts cited for the state share (\$1.3 billion/year) and local assistance share (\$831 million/year) do not add up to the total federal apportionment to California (\$2.31 billion/year). Please clarify.</p> <p><b>25. PP. F-60, 62, 63 – Continue Using Revenues from the State Sales Tax...</b>  In Tables 11, 12, and 14, Orange and San Bernardino counties have the identical dollar amount listed. Is this a typo, or a coincidence? Table 16 shows varying amounts for these two counties.</p>
		<b>EDITORIAL COMMENTS</b>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS <i>DRAFT RTP DOCUMENT</i>	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>There are sections/tables in the RTP and Appendices that reference footnotes, however, the footnotes are missing.</p> <p><b>26. P. 2 – Changes in the Region...</b> The first sentence in the first paragraph should use the word “years” instead of “year”.</p> <p><b>27. P. 6 – Transportation &amp; Air Quality</b> The first and second sentences in the second paragraph should read as follows: “Emissions attributed to on-road mobile sources have demonstrated adverse health impacts. On-road motor vehicles have become one of the major contributing sources for both criteria pollutants (NO<sub>2</sub>, Ozone, CO and PM) and air toxics resulting from diesel exhaust.”</p> <p><b>28. P. 7 – Transportation &amp; Air Quality</b> The second sentence in the fifth paragraph should be completed as follows: “...or found adequate by the EPA can be used for conformity determinations.”</p> <p><b>29. P. 13 – Strategic Investments to Achieve Regional Goals</b> The last sentence in the paragraph should use the word “alternative” instead of “alternatives”.</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<b>P. 28 – Public Outreach &amp; Environmental Justice Issues</b> The last sentence in the first paragraph should end with a period and delete the number four.	30, 32 – 45 Staff will review and incorporate all of the suggested revisions as appropriate.
	<b>P. 39 – Federal Non-Attainment Areas</b> The attainment information for the SCAB should identify the NO <sub>2</sub> Maintenance Plan, approved in 1995.	31. Comment noted.
		<p><i>APPENDICES</i></p> <p><i>APPENDIX C – HIGHWAYS and ARTERIALS</i></p> <p>32. <b>P. C-3 – Baseline Investments</b> The last line of the second-to-last paragraph should have the word “appears” since the subject of the sentence, “percentage” is singular. At the end of that sentence, add the following: “...and is projected to stay at this level through 2005.”</p> <p>33. <b>P. C-17 – Railroad Grade Crossings</b> Table C-14 should be entitled: “Grade Crossing Projects in the RTP”.</p> <p><i>APPENDIX F – FINANCE</i></p> <p>34.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  <b>P. F-3 – Long Term Trends in Transportation Funding</b> Graph 1 should identify a time frame, in years, on the horizontal axis, as Graph 2 does.	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<b>35. P. F-9 – Revenue Sources</b> The word “operations” in the first sentence should be singular.	
		<b>36. P. F-11 – TEA-21</b> In the first sentence of the second paragraph, the term “divided by” should be “divided into.”	
		<b>37. P. F-11 – Expiration of the Local Transportation Sales Tax</b> In the second paragraph, reference should be made to the “retail sales tax.” Although this revenue source is discussed, it is not identified specifically.	
		<b>38. P. F-13 – Expiration of the Local Transportation Sales Tax</b> In the first paragraph, second sentence, replace the words “divided by” with the words “categorized into”.	
		<b>39. P. F-13 – Expiration of the Local Transportation Sales Tax</b> The first paragraph under “Most Impact” is written in the past tense, however, it discusses things that have not yet occurred. The second	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE
ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS		RTP
		<p>sentence of the first paragraph should be re-worded: “revenue streams are projected to incur the greatest impact...” In the next sentence, the word “included” should be changed to “include.”</p> <p><b>40. P. F-13 – Expiration of the Local Transportation Sales Tax</b></p> <p>The abbreviation, “e.g.”, in the first paragraph under “Lesser Impact” always requires a comma after it. The third sentence should read: “...as those on state revenue sources.” Re-word the next sentence to read: “The transit revenues were adjusted based on the proportion....”</p> <p><b>41. P. F-14 – Potential Erosion...</b></p> <p>In the third paragraph, the word “remains” should be changed to “remain,” since the subject (“sales”) is, in this instance, singular.</p> <p><b>42. P. F-33 – Baseline Costs</b></p> <p>The title “4. Operations and Maintenance” should be changed to “Operation and Maintenance.” This should be done for all other references to O &amp; M throughout the RTP and appendices.</p> <p><b>43. P. F-45 – Indexing the State Gas Tax</b></p> <p>In the second sentence of the first paragraph, the abbreviation “i.e.” should be followed by a comma. In the fourth sentence of the second</p>	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>paragraph, the word "estimated" should be changed to "estimates."</p> <p><b>44. P.F-61 – Implement a Revenue Raising Mechanism...</b></p> <p>In the first paragraph, the reference to "dual mode vehicles" should be replaced with the more current terminology "hybrid vehicles."</p>	<p><b>45. P.F-70 – Cost Estimation Methodology...</b></p> <p>Under the "Urban Rail" category, the fifth element refers to "(5 cars consist train set)." It should read "(train set consists of 5 cars)."</p>
Southern California Logistics Airport	<p>Peter Soderquist Airport Manager Southern California Logistics Airport 18484 Phantom Victorville, CA 92394 760/246-6115 760/246-3108 - fax</p>	<p>## Via Phone call to Allan Thompson on 2/9/01</p> <p>In regards to the Aviation noise analysis and Southern California Logistics Airport, the designation for Southern California Logistics is now SCLA, not SCI.</p> <p>The airport is one mile east of Highway 395 and four miles northwest of I-15.</p>	## Comments concerning location and designation of Southern California Logistics Airport are noted.
Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians	<p>Mary E. Belardo The Torres Martinez Desert Cahuilla Indians P. O. Box 1160 66-725 Martinez Road Thermal, CA 92274 760/397-0300</p>	<p>1. Develop a Memorandum of Understanding with the Tribal Leadership to promote a communication as well as accurate information for inclusion into the RTP and RTIP.</p>	<p>1. SCAG would be willing to meet with the tribal leadership to discuss such a memorandum.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
COMMENTS		
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  Ken Bigos Associate Director Air Division United States Environmental Protection Agency Region IX 75 Hawthorne Street San Francisco, CA 94105-3901 415/744-1240	<p><b>1.</b></p> <p><b>Latest Planning Assumptions</b> - The RTP does not provide information on vehicle age and type and does not explain whether the data used is appropriate. The conformity regulations require use of the latest planning assumptions. Recent DOT/EPA guidance states that conformity determinations should include written justification for using data that is not current. We have not been able to determine the age of the data SCAG has relied on with respect to vehicles. SCAG needs to provide that information and provide a justification if it is not using the most current data. Since SCAG used current vehicle data in 1998 to pass conformity, we assumed that SCAG would use current data for the draft RTP.</p>	<p>1. In short, the vehicle registration (i.e., age) distributions, mileage accumulation rates, technology splits and vehicle type mixes used in the RTP emission analyses represent the most currently available data. A detailed explanation is provided below.</p> <p>SCAG used three different versions of the "EMFAC" emission factor models developed by the California Air Resources Board (ARB) to perform the regional emissions analyses in the RTP as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>## EMFACT7F - for the 1994 SIP areas;</li> <li>## MVEI7G (which contains EMFAC7G) - for the 1997 (1999 amended) SIP areas; and</li> <li>## MVEI7G-1c (which contains EMFAC7G1C) - for the non-budget emissions analysis areas.</li> </ul> <p>Each of these versions consist of a series of related computer programs that are executed in sequence to generate composite on-road fleet emission factors as listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>## WEIGHT - generates age distributions, mileage accumulation rates and technology splits by vehicle class;</li> <li>## EMFAC - computes calendar year composite emission factors by vehicle class and ambient conditions (e.g., speed and temperature);</li> <li>## REPORT - produces formatted tables of the EMFAC emission factors; and</li> <li>## BURDEN - estimates region-wide vehicle emissions (in tons/day) by combining emission factors with regional travel activity and fleet mix data.</li> </ul> <p>(The REPORT is not used in the RTP conformity analyses. Fleet mix information from BURDEN is used with the DTIM model to calculate emissions from emission factors and activity data. This approach is consistent with that used to generate the applicable SIP budgets.)</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>The EMFAC7F model was finalized in September 1993. MVEI7G was released in October 1996 and was updated in three successive revisions in July 1997, October 1998 and February 2000, all referred to as MVEI7G-1c.</p> <p>ARB has published a chronological summary of changes in each of these emission factor models releases (<a href="http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/doctabletest/documents/Model_History.doc">http://www.arb.ca.gov/msei/doctabletest/documents/Model_History.doc</a>). From a review of that model history, SCAG determined that vehicle registration/age distributions, mileage accumulation rates and technology mixes were last updated in EMFAC7F, but were not changed through the releases of MVEI7G and MVEI7G-1c.</p> <p>Vehicle type mixes were updated several times in the three releases of MVEI7G-1c. SCAG used the latest vehicle type splits from the final (February 2000) release of MVEI7G-1c as input to DTIM to develop fleet composite emission estimates in the RTP emissions analyses.</p> <p>SCAG also evaluated the feasibility of utilizing updated information on age distributions, mileage accumulation rates, etc. that are being implemented in ARB's EMFAC2000 model. Unfortunately, EMFAC2000 was programmed in a manner that makes it difficult, if not impossible, to "extract" the vehicle age distributions and other fleet information it contains. Unlike its EMFAC7F and MVEI7G predecessors, EMFAC2000 is a single, entirely self-contained program. All information such as registration/age distributions, mileage accumulation rates and vehicle type mixes that could be easily accessed from external data tables or output files in the EMFAC7F and MVEI7G modeling packages are now embedded in programming statements within the EMFAC2000 program. In addition, EMFAC2000 extended the number of explicit vehicle ages being tracked from 25 years to 35 years, which would require "mapping" the distributions back to a structure that could be applied within the EMFAC7F/MVEI7G packages. Another consideration is that EMFAC2000 has not been approved by EPA.</p> <p>As a result of the extreme effort required to extract vehicle fleet information from EMFAC2000, SCAG used those data from EMFAC7F/MVEI7G as</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p><b>2.</b> <b>Baseline and Emissions Reductions – SCAG</b> has not defined baseline projects consistent with the conformity regulations. This needs to be remedied. In addition, the RTP contains much smaller emissions reductions than are committed to in the SIP. Correcting the baseline projects may help to remedy this problem. If not, SCAG should present other options to produce the full emissions reductions in the SIP. The RTP also indicates that there will be 10% ZEVs in 2010. We believe this to be unlikely and that other mixes of vehicles should be considered. The Conformity report states that credit is taken for what we believe is Rule 2202 (it says 2020), but does not explain how credit was estimated. We would like to see the calculations for this credit.</p> <p>2. First, SCAG staff has defined baseline projects consistent with the conformity regulations for the final RTP.</p> <p>Secondly, neither conformity regulations nor the SIP require that individual control measures achieve the same emission reductions specified in the SIP. Instead, the conformity regulations require emissions in milestone and attainment years to be less than the budgets established in the applicable SIP. The Draft 2001 RTP has demonstrated that emissions from each air basin are less than the applicable budgets for each air basin in the SCAG region. Thus, SCAG has fulfilled the SIP obligations defined in the 1999 Ozone SIP.</p> <p>Third, the statement "10% ZEVs in 2010" in the Draft RTP is incorrect and will be taken out of the RTP documents wherever it appears. The fact that there will be less ZEVs on the road in 2010, however, does not reduce the emissions credits associated with the ZEV mandate. While CARB has made many changes to the ZEV mandate, they have worked to ensure that the emissions benefits of the original mandate have not been diminished. As a result, the credit claimed for the ZEV program in EMFAC7G, the model employed in the RTP analysis, is still valid.</p> <p>The 1999 Ozone SIP is the binding SIP until the next SIP is approved. The District has made commitment with other sources of emission reduction credits to off-set the Rule 2202 shortfall. Though the commitment was not included in the 1999 Ozone SIP Amendment, it was part of the approval process. Thus, emission reductions estimated for the 2001 RTP do not need to be adjusted.</p>	<p>3. <b>PM10 Construction Emissions – The Conformity Appendix</b> states that there is no need to address emissions from construction of facilities because there are no applicable PM SIPs. As explained in EPA's guidance memo of</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>October 28, 1996, this requirement applies if submitted SIPs identify construction emissions as contributing to PM10 problems. We believe the submitted SIPs in the SCAG region do show construction to be a factor.</p> <p><b>4.</b> <b>Maglev</b> – Maglev is an uncertain technology which faces many hurdles to its future development. Reliance on implementing such a system in the short term seems imprudent. SCAG should at the very least present detailed schedules and a demonstration of resources to implement Maglev. SCAG should also show robust alternatives to provide those emissions reductions if Maglev is not implemented.</p> <p><b>5.</b> <b>Financing</b> – The RTP is based on the assumption that all existing sales taxes will be renewed, that a new one will pass, that the State can be relied on for general fund revenues and that taxes will be assessed on vehicles that do not pay gas taxes. This strikes us as very optimistic. We certainly encourage SCAG to seek expansion of user fees. However, we do not consider that SCAG has shown that these funds are reasonably expected to be available. Therefore, the requirement to demonstrate fiscal constraint has not been met.</p> <p>4. Currently SCAG staff is working closely with subregions to identify local projects that are not included in the RTP, or projects included in the RTP but are not modeled for any emission reduction benefits. These emission reduction benefits are in addition to what have been shown in the draft plan. These additional emission reduction credits should be able to offset any shortfall associated with the absence of Maglev.</p> <p>5. There have been some revisions to the funding strategy identified in the RTP. The strategy is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Continue the state sales tax on gasoline for transportation purposes.</li> <li>2) Continue local transportation sales taxes where necessary (note, extension is not assumed in Orange County and imposition is not assumed in Ventura County).</li> <li>3) Adjust the state motor vehicle fuel excise tax and user-fee to maintain historical purchasing power.</li> </ol> <p>This last component includes implementing a revenue raising mechanism on alternative fuels beginning in the year 2010, assuming a rate that is equivalent to the current gasoline tax. Additionally, this component includes adjusting all motor vehicle fuel taxes by a total of 10 cents. That is, an increase of 5 cents in 2010, and then an increase of 1 penny annually through 2015.</p> <p>SCAG is simply proposing a funding strategy to maintain revenues that might otherwise be lost in the years to come. SCAG maintains that these are</p>		

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>SCAG is already pursuing efforts to implement this funding strategy. We are working with local counties to pursue continuation of local transportation sales tax measures. In light of the recent passage of local (1/2 percent) sales taxes by more than 2/3<sup>rd</sup> vote in both Santa Clara County and Alameda County, SCAG contends that assumptions about extensions are reasonable.</p> <p>SCAG has also introduced Assembly Bill 227 to indefinitely extend the dedication of the sales tax on gasoline for transportation purposes. Please note that on March 17, 2001, the Assembly Transportation Committee overwhelmingly approved (17-0) AB 227. A number of organizations, including the League of California Cities, California State Association of Counties, and all the transportation commissions in our region testified in favor of the bill.</p> <p>Additionally, SCAG plans to pursue efforts to further study options for maintaining the purchasing power of motor vehicle fuel excise tax revenues. SCAG recognizes that inflation coupled with technological developments (more fuel-efficient vehicles and alternative fuel vehicles) will continue to diminish the purchasing power of state motor vehicle fuel excise tax revenues. It is not unreasonable to anticipate that a mechanism would have to be in place to recoup the erosion of transportation revenues. Moreover, historical gas tax rate changes provide the basis for further rate adjustments as the need arises. That is, the current state gas tax was last increased over a five-year window period from 1990 to 1994, when it was doubled from 9 cents to 18 cents per gallon. SCAG is anticipating that a similar increase would occur fifteen to twenty years later</p> <p><b>6. Transit –</b> We are concerned that SCAG is planning a much larger percentage increase in rail service compared to bus service. Trains have a history of being expensive and of potentially encouraging sprawl while not serving the transit-dependent. Bus service, including</p> <p>6.</p> <p>The final RTP has a major focus on Rapid Bus corridors. The majority of corridors are Rapid Bus. A few rail lines have been proposed in areas that will encourage fill. In the future SCAG will be focusing on ways of encouraging mixed use development at train stations.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Ventura County Air Pollution Control Board	<p>Ben Cacatian            Air Quality Specialist            Planning and Evaluation            Division            Ventura County Air Pollution            Control Board            669 County Square Drive            Ventura, CA 93003            805/645-1400            805/645-1444 – fax  <a href="http://www.vcapcd.org">www.vcapcd.org</a></p>	<p>rapid bus, is generally less expensive, quicker to implement, and supportive of compact, mixed use development. We urge SCAG to consider providing better support for express, rapid and local bus service. We think this will be better for the environment and will create a more equitable transit system.</p> <p>1. The first line of the intra-regional high-speed system, LAX to March Inland Port is anticipated to be completed and fully operated by 2010. The full system (all three lines) is assumed to be completed and operational by 2025. Currently SCAG staff is working closely with subregions to identify local projects that are not included in the RTP, or projects included in the RTP but are not modeled for any emission reduction benefits. These emission reduction benefits are in addition to what have been shown in the draft plan. These additional emission reduction credits should be able to offset any shortfall associated with the absence of Maglev.</p> <p>2. SCAG staff has worked closely with LACMTA staff in an attempt to achieve consistency between the RTP and the LRTP.</p> <p>3. See response to bullet 1.</p> <p>4. SCAG plans to pursue legislative measures and further study to begin the implementation of alternative funding proposals. The final RTP will include a section outlining some of these strategies.</p> <p>The RTP identifies the need for implementing alternative funding strategies to address the financial shortfall and ensure conformity. However, the plan does not clearly identify criteria or milestones that will activate the</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>5. The Alternative Funding Strategy section in Appendix F, assumes a new local half percent sales tax in Ventura County and tax on alternative fuels. How does SCAG plan to gain support for either strategy?</p> <p>6. RTP Document: Page 2, Changes in the Region: The first sentence in the first paragraph should use the word "years" instead of "year". Page 13, Strategic Investments to Achieve Regional Goals: The last sentence in the paragraph should use the word "alternatives" instead of "alternative." Page 28, the top sentence ends with the number 4 instead of a period. Page 40, Applicable SIP, Second paragraph, "SSAB," should be SCCAB" for Ventura County</p> <p>7. Appendix C-Highways and Arterials – Page C-3, Baseline Investments: The last line of the fourth paragraph should have the work "appears" since the subject of the sentence is singular. Appendix F – Finance: Page F-3, Long Term Trends in Transportation Funding: Graph 1 should identify a time frame in years, on the horizontal axis, as Graph 2 does. Page F-9, Revenue Sources: The word "operations" in the first sentence should be singular. Page F-11, TEA-21: In the first sentence of the second</p>	<p>In response to the question concerning the imposition of a local sales tax in Ventura County, SCAG no longer makes this assumption in the final 2001 RTP. The alternative fuel tax proposal is a means to offset the potential penetration of alternative fuel vehicles and in turn, the loss of gas tax revenues. SCAG plans to pursue further study of this option. Corrections have been incorporated into the finance section of the Technical Appendix.</p> <p>6, 7, 8 Comments noted, and corrections have been made to final RTP as appropriate.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>paragraph, the term should be “divided into” not “divided by”. Also, the dollar amounts cited for the state share and local assistance share do not add up to the total federal apportionment to California. Please clarify. Page F-13: In the first paragraph, second sentence, replace the words “divided by” with the words “separated into”. Page F-13, Most Impact: The first paragraph is written in the past tense. I believe that this section refers to things that have not yet happened. Page F-13, Lesser Impact: The abbreviation, “e.g.” in the first paragraph is missing a comma. Page F-14, Potential Erosion: In the third paragraph, the word “remains” should be changed to “remain.” Page F-20, State Revenue Sources: Is the RTP explanation correct that revenue is based on projects programmed projects instead of revenue sources? Pages F-60, F-62, and F-63: In Tables 11, 12, and 14, Orange and San Bernardino counties have the same dollar amounts listed. Page F-33, Baseline Costs: I believe “Operations and Maintenance” should be “Operation and Maintenance.” Page F-45, Indexing the State Gas Tax: In the second sentence of the first paragraph, the abbreviation “i.e.” should be followed by a comma. Page F-61, Implement a Revenue Raising Mechanism: In the first paragraph, “dual mode vehicles” should be replaced with the more current terminology “hybrid vehicles.” Page F-70, Cost Estimation Methodology: Under the “Urban Rail” category, the fifth item should be “(train set consists of 5 cars)” not “(5 cars consist train set).”</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>8. Appendix H – Transportation Conformity Report: The page numbering should be the same format as all other appendices with the appendix letter next to the page number. Page 84, Subsection g: Rule 2020 should be Rule 2202. Page 101, 1997 Ozone SIP (SCAB): The third sentence says, “1994 Ozone SIP/AQMD.” Change AQMD to AQMP. Page 102, 1994 Ozone SIP (VCI/SCCAB): In the note, the 2001 RTP should be consistent with the 2000 RTP not the 2001 RTP.</p>	<p>1. Because of the change in position concerning joint-use at Point Mugu, and the long lead time between airport planning and airport operation, ground access requirements would be more appropriately addressed in the Airport Master Plan, if necessary. SCAG recognizes that there are limited funds to pay for ground access improvements.</p> <p>Two aviation scenarios analyzed in the 2001 RTP PEIR included joint use at Pt. Mugu. Such use will have to be evaluated by the implementing agency in a project specific EIR or EIS.</p> <p><b>Regionally Significant Projects – Revisions for RTP</b></p> <p>2. The Baseline Regionally Significant Projects (Exh. 5.3) map should be revised to also include the widening of Route 101 from Vineyard</p> <p>2 - 8. Other comments noted. Where appropriate, comments have been incorporated into the 2001 RTP.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>3. There are no plans to widen State Route 34 from Route 118 to Oxnard Blvd. This project should be removed from the identified Highway and Corridor Projects (Exh. 5.5) map.</p> <p>4. Route 118 improvement project is incorrectly illustrated on the Highway and Corridor Projects map (Exh. 5.5). The project limits should be shown to be from Tapo Canyon Road to Vineyard Avenue (SR 232).</p> <p><b>Finance</b></p> <p>5. Continuation of the current local sales tax measures, and the imposition of a new sales tax in Ventura County.</p> <p>6. Dedicated Use of Sales Tax on Gasoline (extending the Governor's transportation funding program beyond it's current sunset in 2006.</p> <p>7. Assessment of an alternative fuel tax (in an amount equivalent to the decline in gas tax revenue due to alternative fuel vehicle use).</p> <p>8.</p>	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Western Riverside Council of Governmen ts	Supervisor Bob Buster, 1 <sup>st</sup> District WRCOG, Chair William G. Kleindienst RCTC Chairman Western Riverside Council of Governments 909/787-7985	Adjust the state excise tax on fuel by five cents between 2005 and 2010, and one-cent annually thereafter.	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Currently SCAG staff is working closely with subregions to identify local projects that are not included in the RTP, or projects included in the RTP but are not modeled for any emission reduction benefits. These emission reduction benefits are in addition to what have been shown in the draft plan. These additional emission reduction credits should be able to offset any shortfall associated with the absence of Maglev.</p> <p>2. <b>Air Quality:</b> The RTP as proposed meets the Air Quality requirements, however:  If Maglev is omitted from the Plan and the MTA Board actions deliver projects other than what are in the RTP, the Plan will not meet the air quality conformity requirements.  The draft RTP indicates that the Maglev program includes “interlinking” with the proposed CHSRS. What are the emissions reductions associated with the HSRS in the SCAG region? There is no other reference to the HSRS which the CHSRA received an additional \$5 million from the Governor’s Transportation Program last July for Tier 1 environmental impact statement.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>3. The RHNA debate with the State Department of Housing and HCD could further exacerbate the area being out of conformance. The HCD continues to insist that our region is “short” on</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>housing stock when all of the local agencies confirm the region has more than enough. By using an artificially high growth projection, the model will forecast an additional 1-2 tons per day of Reactive Organic Gas emissions and additional 2-3 tons per day of NOx from vehicles that are not in the current plan. In addition, it is our understanding that the housing contemplated by HCD could result in an additional 48 million vehicle miles traveled to the existing transportation system. SCAG needs to continue its challenge to the State numbers, as it is important that we utilize reality-based growth forecasts.</p> <p><b>4.</b></p> <p><b>Aviation:</b></p> <p>Additional analysis should be made regarding the feasibility, acceptability and market demand of Scenario 8. How realistic SCAG's scenario for nearly 30 MAP at El Toro is remains unclear. Likewise, the City of Ontario and surrounding communities do not support 30 MAP at the Ontario airport. It is our understanding that these communities prefer to limit Ontario's capacity to approximately 20-25 MAP.</p> <p><b>5.</b></p> <p><b>Growth:</b></p> <p>Artificially high housing forecasts exacerbate modeled air quality and mobility impacts. By inflating projected housing stock the model is forced to project people/households in a manner that will result in 263,200 additional vehicle trips and an additional 4.8 million vehicle miles</p>	<p>Comments noted. A number of scenarios were examined that had no El Toro and/or an Ontario within its existing physical capacity. Please see RTP Technical Appendix B, Aviation. A total of nine aviation scenarios were developed.</p> <p><b>4.</b></p> <p><b>Aviation:</b></p> <p>Comments noted. A number of scenarios were examined that had no El Toro and/or an Ontario within its existing physical capacity. Please see RTP Technical Appendix B, Aviation. A total of nine aviation scenarios were developed.</p> <p><b>5.</b></p> <p><b>Growth:</b></p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p><b>6.</b> <b>Goods Movement:</b> Funding and Subregional Equity – in Technical Appendix E under Goods Movement, issues, implications and options were identified for the fourteen adopted GMAC focus areas, statements were made regarding 1) Transportation Funding for Freight Movement and 2) Regional/Subregional Equity in Funding/Project Development.</p> <p>The two statements were made by the Goods Movement Advisory Committee to emphasize the relevance and importance of the movement of goods across and through the region for the benefit of the region and the nation as a whole. This needs to be strongly emphasized in the 2001 RTP including an action statement, which appears to be missing, that pursues funding from the state, federal and private sectors and that is both adequate and equitable for the subregions.</p> <p><b>7.</b> <b>Truck Lanes –</b> The SR60 project is part of the Southwest Passage which is of national importance, yet the study ends at Interstate 15. While 70% of the cost of truck lanes is expected to come from local, state and federal sources, there is no apparent action to aggressively seek federal or state funding. The impacts extend beyond the Los Angeles subregion and benefits extend beyond the SCAG region. Further study</p> <p>6. Issues of funding equity will be addressed further in the Finance Section of the final RTP document. The Freight Factors Subcommittee of SCAG's Goods Movement Advisory Committee will continue its work in support of developing and refining the way in which foreign and non-local domestic freight is measured and weighted in the federal funding formula for the National Highway System.</p> <p>7. SCAG has asked Caltrans for the funding to conduct a PSR on the SR-60 Truck Lane Project. Technically the SR-60 is not included, although it may be considered that the 60 Freeway from the I-10 in Riverside and the I-215/SR-91 Junction in Riverside might be eligible for Southwest Passage improvements if and when funding becomes available for the California segments of the Passage. Exhibit 8.1 in the Plan depicts SCAG's strategy for corridor preservation relative to the Southwest Passage west of Colton Crossing/San Bernardino.</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	beyond the Orangethorpe and ACE corridors is necessary as well as seeking an appropriate level of funding from sources outside of the SCAG region for these efforts.	Comment noted that study of railroad lines beyond the Orangethorpe Corridor and Alameda Corridor East is necessary and that funding from sources outside the region should be sought.
8.	<p>On page 84 of the draft RTP, under "Inland Ports and Inland Intermodal Terminals", a statement is made regarding increased trade volume and that the land in the Inland Empire could provide for sorting and storage of marine containers. It further states, that "shuttle trains could carry containers to the Inland Empire as a substitute for truck drayage, alleviating some truck traffic on east-west freeways or even avoiding the need for an SR60 truck lane project." We strongly support the action statement to conduct a study of an inland port in the near term, so that the proposed truck lane on SR60 can be either eliminated from the plan or considered for further study.</p>	<p>The inland port study is already underway by SCAG staff, the first part to look at feasibility of a "stand-alone" facility for marine containers. It will be noted that the San Pedro Bay Ports have rejected, for now, the inland port concept and have said they are opposed also to a demonstration project. Also, in today's transportation system, rail freight is predominant only in the long-haul markets with a shipment length of over 800 miles and is usually considered by economists to be infeasible for short distances of under 100 miles, suggesting that a shuttle train substituting for drayage might have to be subsidized. Further, such an operation might very well have to use a larger inland domestic container yard as a base of support.</p>
9.		<p>Comments noted. Aviation staff coordinated with Goods Movement staff in the drafting of action statements for air cargo in the goods movement program. It is anticipated that coordination between Aviation and Goods Movement staff will increase in the future, particularly in the development of a new regional air cargo study that is proposed to be initiated this year. It is anticipated that this study will address potential ground impacts around existing and proposed new cargo-handling airports using SCAG's Heavy Duty Truck Model.</p> <p>Air Cargo – The draft RTP primarily focuses on the top eight priority areas pertain to goods movement; air cargo is the ninth on the list and therefore is not addressed in the goods movement section. It is, however, addressed in the aviation section which causes a disconnect between the relationship of air cargo to goods movement and the associated action statements. As an example, the action statement under "Air Cargo" supports the utilization and expansion of</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>10. Rail Crossings – The RTP identifies the impacts, cost and need for at-grade rail crossing improvements from other studies, except for the Inland Empire studies. Without this information, the impacts of increased rail traffic beyond the Alameda Corridor East and Orangethorpe Corridors are misrepresented. The statement, improvements to the main line railroad corridors will extend many of the benefits of the Alameda Corridor eastward, providing a conduit for Pacific Rim trade”, appears short sighted. The improvements to the main line railroad corridors will result in increased rail traffic, which will negatively impact Riverside County and other subregions east of the Alameda Corridor East and Orangethorpe Corridors, if additional improvements are not made within these subregions.</p> <p>11. On page 81 of the Draft RTP, last paragraph, please identify the limits of the UP Yuma Main Line as “extending east from Colton to Mecca in the Coachella Valley”.</p> <p>12. <b>Financing:</b> To implement the 2001 RTP, as</p>
		<p>12, 13, 14</p> <p>SCAG recognizes the importance of education and outreach in pursuing the</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>proposed, the region would need to generate additional revenues to fund the plan. SCAG's Long Range Finance Task Force should be commended for the work they did to identify strategies that could make the RTP whole.</p> <p>We support the following revised strategies per SCAG February 16, 2001 meeting with the exception of strategy Number 3:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Continue using revenues from the state sales tax on gasoline for transportation purposes (as implemented through the Governor's transportation funding program). RCTC Position: Support</li> <li>2) Continue local transportation sales taxes, where necessary. RCTC Position: Support</li> <li>3) Adjust the state excise motor vehicle fuel tax rate and user fees to maintain historical purchasing power. RCTC Position: Recommend further study on the adjustment to the motor vehicle fuel tax and review alternative revenue raising mechanisms. Any taxing adjustments upward must include a comprehensive educational program for the affected taxpayers.</li> </ol> <p>13. In order to be successful with implementing strategies that may require legislation or a vote of the people, emphasis will need to be placed</p> <p>adjustment of the state fuel tax rate and a revenue raising mechanism on alternative fuels. Accordingly, SCAG is proposing further study of such options. The SCAG-sponsored Assembly Concurrent Resolution 32 (Dutra) requests that the California Transportation Commission (CTC), in consultation with the California Department of Transportation (Caltrans) and regional transportation planning agencies, prepare a study focusing on potential decreases in transportation revenues. The study would identify those areas where transportation revenues are anticipated to decline or the purchasing power of funding sources may decline over time and suggest legislative remedies to address potential funding shortfalls. Furthermore, SCAG proposes a state budget augmentation to fund a study for the purposes of assessing the impact of alternative fuel vehicles on transportation funding.</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS  SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>14. California is ranked 38<sup>th</sup> out of the 50 U.S. States in their as tax rate and ranked 44<sup>th</sup> in comparison of gas tax revenues per capita. California is lagging behind other States in its gas tax rate and revenues based on population and/or registered drivers. The last gas tax rate adjustment was in 1994. An increase in the State gas tax is reasonable in order to provide an adequate source of revenue for the region and to keep pace with the rest of the country's tax rates.</p> <p>15. <b>CETAP:</b> The value gained from a project of this magnitude is significant to the SCAG region as well as the Inland Empire and should be recognized in the RTP as being regionally significant, including actions and statements that indicate SCAG's ongoing support and funding for a Federally recognized streamlined environmental and transportation planning process.</p> <p>16. <b>Strategic Arterial Improvements/Smart Streets:</b> Van Buren Boulevard and Mockingbird Canyon have been removed from the list of "Smart Street" projects.</p>	<p>on education and outreach throughout the region and the state. Coordination will be essential to gain the momentum needed for implementation. This should be addressed in the RTP.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Appropriate revision acknowledging the CETAP process has been incorporated into the final RTP.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
17.	<p><b>Minor Technical Corrections to Project List:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Page K-22, change description on Rte 74 from arterial improvements to “widen from 2 to 4 lanes”.</li> <li>2) On I-215, I-15 to S/O Newport, change description from “Add to HOV lanes” to Add 2 HOV lanes and 2 mixed flow lanes”.</li> <li>3) Add interchange improvements on I-10 and SR 60 near Beaumont, year 2020, \$10 million.</li> <li>4) Page K-24, On I-10, Construct IC at 2.7 mi. of Dillon to 5 mi. of Dillon, add “McNaughton IC” to description.</li> </ol>	<p>1. Comment noted. Comment will be considered for incorporation in the final plan as appropriate.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. Comment will be considered for incorporation in the final plan as appropriate.</p> <p>3. Comment noted. Comment will be considered for incorporation in the final plan as appropriate.</p> <p>4. Comment noted. Comment will be considered for incorporation in the final plan as appropriate.</p>	17.

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
2001 DRAFT REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN  
COMMENTS BY INDIVIDUALS AND NON-PROFIT GROUPS**

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	GENERAL COMMENTS RECEIVED (Letters, Phone, Faxes)	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Alameda Corridor Jobs Coalition	Johanna Sanchez Case Manager Alameda Corridor Jobs Coalition 2905 S. Vermont Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90007 323/373-1091 323/373-1094 – fax	1. According to Gateway Cities and CITT, international trade will be booming within the next 20 years and with it, increasing movement of goods. This means more trucks, more toxic emissions, and more health risks like cancer will be more common. I think that exclusive truck lanes will be a poor solution to mitigate the problem.	1. Truck lanes are included in the RTP in order to reduce peak hour delay and unsafe traffic conditions relating to the interweaving of trucks and automobiles; to handle the growing numbers of trucks; to improve truck throughput; and to ensure continued vitality of goods movement, by moving freight with less congestion and delay. The 2001 Program EIR and the RTP environmental justice analysis programmatically evaluate air toxic impacts in the region. Controls on diesel engines are expected to reduce air toxics in the region by 2025. In December 2000, agreements were reached with the US EPA to reduce 97% of the sulfur from diesel fuel and to cut diesel soot by 95%.	1. The investments of the RTP are the result of several years of work involving Task Forces, County Transportation Commissions, local and subregional government, public organizations, and individual members of the public. The RTP is financially constrained yet at the same time must meet air quality and mobility goals set forth by the Regional Council. The projects have been analyzed for their performance based on the adopted set of performance indicators. The 2001 RTP allocates about 60% of funding to transit, though it carries a far smaller share of travelers.
Arkin, Patricia Feiner Arkin	Patricia Feiner Arkin P. O. box 779 Somis, CA 93066	1. I would like to have seen the RTP much more heavily focused on the need to improve both the quantity and quality of public transportation. Instead, the RTP over invests in policies of the past, putting too much continued emphasis on the automobile, trucks and the building of every more and every wider highways as the primary movers of people and goods. This ongoing SCAG policy will continue to aggravate rather than relieve our every worsening problems with congestion.		

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>2. Although the automobile may well be the primary transportation choice for many southern Californians for some time to come, nevertheless, the lack of viable alternatives to the automobile continues to leave an unhealthy imbalance in our transportation planning.</p> <p>3. Specific recommendations would include improved bus and rail transit with increased frequency, speeds, capacity, route, and better coordination of public transportation services both within population centers and between population centers.</p>	<p><b>2-3.</b> To maintain the per capita transit ridership goal a mix of projects have been proposed that will provide good alternatives to the automobile in the near future. The services will have increased frequency, increased speeds, and better coordination.</p> <p><b>4-5.</b> I was disappointed to see that the RTP didn't make any really serious strides toward acknowledging the link between transportation planning and land use planning.</p> <p>4. The challenges of future population and employment growth and their effect on traffic congestion, transportation investment choices, air quality and housing needs are significant long-range planning issues. In response, SCAG has created the Growth Visioning Subcommittee to inform, engage and facilitate consensus on a "Vision" - a strategy for addressing the challenging consequences of anticipated growth in the region. Specifically, this Subcommittee will provide a policy framework for growth forecasts; provide direction on producing alternative urban form scenarios; consider</p> <p>5. I would especially like to have seen the RTP make a much more serious commitment to the concept of palling and designing more "livable and walkable communities" I believe advocacy and planning aimed at the reduction of demand</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>for transportation services should be as much a part of SCAG's transportation planning role as is the planning for transportation infrastructure.</p>	<p>balanced and efficient growth and transportation patterns; and consider other sustainable development and environmental issues.</p> <p>A key strategy of SCAG's Livable Communities program is encouraging efficient growth patterns that promote alternatives to the automobile by creating a mix of homes, shops, work places, parks, schools and civic institutions that are linked to pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly public transportation centers. The Draft 2001 RTP Update includes a number of policies that support the local governments' development of pedestrian- and transit-friendly livable communities.</p> <p>6. Comment noted. SCAG has conducted an extensive, good faith effort to include the public in the regional transportation planning process. SCAG's public input process will continue to be improved in subsequent plans.</p>
<p>Automobile Club of Southern California Dan Beal Manager, Public Policy and Programs Automobile Club of Southern California P. O. Box 25001 Santa Ana, CA 92799-5001 714/885-2306</p>	<p>I think there is a great need for improvement in SCAG's public outreach process. I do not think there yet exists sufficient inclusion of private citizens and residents in SCAG's planning process.</p>	<p>1. <b>Revise funding strategies</b> to incorporate updated revenue and cost estimates and include more realistic revenue proposals that better reflect public attitudes regarding fuel tax increases – which make approval of the proposed 20 cent per gallon increase very unlikely.</p> <p>2. <b>Include effective capital projects and new services</b> that will efficiently advance the region's goals to improve mobility and air quality and that can be completed within the plan period. Underutilized or incomplete</p> <p>1. SCAG has made significant revisions to the RTP funding strategies in the final RTP. The proposed fuel tax increase has been revised. SCAG is now proposing a total 10 cents increase – 5 cents in 2010 and then one penny annually through 2015.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. One of the main goals of the RTP is to improve air quality and mobility with a financially constrained plan that meets performance goals, including cost-effectiveness.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p><b>3.</b> Provide for adequate operations and maintenance needs for all existing and planned projects and services including a substantial increase in funds for needed road and bridge maintenance and repair and sufficient operating funds for all existing and expanded transit services.</p> <p><b>4.</b> <b>Finance:</b> The draft RTP published in December 2000 estimates that the region faces a total shortfall of \$10.7 billion to complete all baseline, or committed, projects and to operate and maintain all existing and committed transportation services and facilities. To address this shortfall, and to provide additional funds for new projects and services, the draft RTP recommends the following funding strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue existing local transportation sales taxes that are scheduled to expire, and impose a new a new transportation sales tax in Ventura County.</li> <li>Permanently maintain the direction of revenues from the state sales tax on gasoline to transportation.</li> </ul> <p>Assess alternative fuel vehicles an equivalent “gas tax” for their use of the road network.</p> <p>Increase the state excise fuel tax by five cents between 2005 and 2010 and by one cent</p>	<p>3. Operation and maintenance costs for the existing system and new projects are accounted for in both the baseline and plan.</p> <p>4. The proposed funding strategy in the Final 2001 RTP has been substantially revised to reflect new needs. The revised strategy for public funds is as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Continue the state sales tax on gasoline for transportation purposes.</li> <li>2) Continue local transportation sales taxes where necessary (note, extension is not assumed in Orange County and imposition is not assumed in Ventura County).</li> <li>3) Adjust the state motor vehicle fuel excise tax and user-fee to maintain historical purchasing power.</li> </ol> <p>This last component includes implementing a revenue raising mechanism on alternative fuels beginning in the year 2010, assuming a rate that is equivalent to the current gasoline tax. Additionally, this component includes adjusting all motor vehicle fuel taxes by a total of 10 cents. That is, an increase of 5 cents in 2010, and then an increase of 1 penny annually through 2015.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>annually thereafter through 2025 for a total increase of 20 cents. Combined, these measures, if enacted, would generate an estimated \$40.1 billion over the plan period. This would provide \$29.4 billion for new projects and services, which are proposed in the plan.</p> <p>A revised financial forecast distributed to the Finance Task Force on March 5, 2001, however, indicates that instead of a shortfall for baseline projects and services there is actually a surplus of \$8.8 billion dollars and that only \$15.7 billion is needed in new revenues to fund all proposed new projects and services in the plan. Clearly, the funding strategies need to be modified to reflect the revised revenue and cost estimates.</p> <p>In addition to revising the strategies to reflect current projections, the revenue recommendation also needs to be changed to be able to garner sufficient public support and, therefore, to meet federal reasonableness requirements. Strategies one through three each appear to meet USDOT's requirement that all proposed funding sources be "reasonably expected to be available." Strategy four, as it is currently envisioned, does not meet this test.</p> <p>Strategy One, with the exception of the imposition of a new transportation sales tax in Ventura County, maintains existing taxes that have been approved by voters and would clearly meet the federal reasonableness requirement. Strategy Two is also an existing transportation</p> <p>SCAG is simply proposing a funding strategy to maintain revenues that might otherwise be lost in the years to come. SCAG maintains that these are reasonably expected available revenues.</p> <p>SCAG is already pursuing efforts to implement this funding strategy. We are working with local counties to pursue continuation of local transportation sales tax measures. In light of the recent passage of local (1/2 percent) sales taxes by more than 2/3<sup>rd</sup> vote in both Santa Clara County and Alameda County, SCAG contends that assumptions about extensions are reasonable.</p> <p>SCAG has also introduced Assembly Bill 227 to indefinitely extend the dedication of the sales tax on gasoline for transportation purposes. Please note that on March 17, 2001, the Assembly Transportation Committee overwhelmingly approved (17-0) AB 227. A number of organizations, including the League of California Cities, California State Association of Counties, and all the transportation commissions in our region testified in favor of the bill.</p> <p>Additionally, SCAG plans to pursue efforts to further study options for maintaining the purchasing power of motor vehicle fuel excise tax revenues. SCAG recognizes that inflation coupled with technological developments (more fuel-efficient vehicles and alternative fuel vehicles) will continue to diminish the purchasing power of state motor vehicle fuel excise tax revenues. It is not unreasonable to anticipate that a mechanism would have to be in place to recoup the erosion of transportation revenues. Moreover, historical gas tax rate changes provide the basis for further rate adjustments as the need arises. That is, the current state</p>	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>funding source that, without further action, would be eliminated in 2006. This strategy also appears to meet the reasonableness test. The Auto Club supported the original imposition of local transportation sales taxes and supported the governor's direction of sales taxes on gasoline to transportation as part of his Traffic Congestion Relief Plan in 2000. We are currently evaluating proposals for indefinitely extending the dedication of fuel related sales taxes to transportation.</p>	<p>gas tax was last increased over a five-year window period from 1990 to 1994, when it was doubled from 9 cents to 18 cents per gallon. SCAG is recognizing that a similar increase would occur sixteen years later.</p> <p>Strategy Three is a new tax but it has solid links to both existing fuel taxes – the foundation of transportation finance in the United States – and the Finance Task Force's principle that system users should pay to finance the facilities and services they require. Alternative fuel vehicles use roadways, cause wear and tear, and contribute to congestion like all other vehicles. Their use should also be taxed like other vehicles. And, because of its link and similarity to existing transportation taxes, the alternative fuels "gas tax equivalent" is likely to be accepted by USDOT as a reasonably available revenue source.</p> <p>Inclusion of alternative fuel/propulsion vehicles within California's fuel and transportation tax structure should not, however, result in any negative impact on the development, sale, or use of such vehicles. Other strategies can be used to encourage the development of a viable market for zero, or near zero, emitting vehicles in California. For example, rebates and tax</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		incentives can be used to encourage purchase and use by motorists.	<p>Strategy Four lacks the prerequisites we believe are required to gain public support for any excise tax increase and, therefore, does not meet the federal reasonableness test. In fact, the governor, according to a SCAG legislative report, has publicly stated that he cannot support an increase in fuel taxes and, instead, has opted to tap general funds for transportation needs. Prerequisites for any fuel tax increase include a demonstration of the efficient use of existing fuel tax revenues and a clear determination of need that is linked to an inventory of high performing projects to be funded.</p> <p>In 1990 voters approved Proposition 111, which increased fuel taxes by five cents in that year and by one cent per year for four additional years for a total nine cent increase. The Auto Club supported Proposition 111. Proposition 111 was part of a statewide ten-year transportation improvement package developed by a special task force created by the governor. The package included substantial research, project determination, public involvement, oversight requirements, and, ultimately, a direct vote of the people. These elements, and the consensus achieved in 1990, do not exist today. In addition, SCAG's revised financial forecast does not indicate a need for the amount of funds that would be generated by increasing gas taxes by 20 cents. A more modest and longer term approach to increasing fuel taxes would be more</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>appropriate at this time. Such an approach might include the establishment of a statewide group, which includes appropriate representation of user interests, to more fully explore the need and options for making changes to fuel tax rates, with the intent of developing a Proposition 111-type approach.</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <p>The final RTP should include strategies one through three and eliminate strategy four. Implementation of strategies one through three alone would generate \$21.7 billion, enough to cover the \$15.7 billion needed to fund all existing and new projects and services proposed in the draft RTP and to provide \$6 billion for additional projects that are not currently in the plan.</p> <p>Instead of Strategy Four, SCAG should take the lead in establishing a statewide working group to explore the need for, and feasibility of, a Proposition 111-type effort.</p> <p><b>5. Transit Services and Projects</b>  A successful public transit network – including buses, urban rail, commuter rail, and specialized shuttle services – is critical to meeting our transportation needs. It provides mobility for people who can't drive (or prefer not to) and is an option for those who regularly drive cars.</p> <p>Public transit, however, does not currently meet</p> <p>Comments and suggestions are noted. Nearly all of the recommendations are included in some form in the Final 2001 RTP.</p> <p># A study of jitney/shuttle services will be conducted in the next fiscal year. This type of service can provide on call service to more areas and can be provided by the private sector.</p> <p># The RTP includes a set of performance objectives. One performance indicator is cost effectiveness.</p>	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>the needs of most commuters and travelers in Southern California. Only 2% of all trips and about 4% of home-to-work trips use transit in the SCAG region (and close to 9% of commuters use public transit in Los Angeles County). The draft RTP notes that, after spending \$134 billion on transportation improvements (with almost 60% of the funds going to transit projects and services), mode split figures will have changed only slightly, with transit accounting for 2.1% of total trips and 4.9% of home-to-work trips in 2025 (with higher and lower rates in various areas throughout the region).</p> <p>To maximize its potential benefits, transit services need to be more flexible, more efficient, better coordinated across city and county lines, and better integrated with other modes of travel, including the automobile. The following are options for achieving these goals that should be included in the final RTP (either as approved projects and strategies or as demonstration projects):</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Use smaller transit vehicles with state-of-the-art communications to provide on-call services to more areas.</li> <li>Increase private sector involvement to reduce costs, improve services, and stretch limited transit resources.</li> </ul> <p>Allocate limited transportation tax dollars to</p>	<p># Intelligent Transportation System technologies are fully endorsed by SCAG as a means for enhancing mobility on arterials and enhancing the service provided to patrons of public transit.</p> <p># In the next fiscal year an alternative transportation study will be conducted. This study will allow the Transit Task Force to focus on inventive solutions to our transportation problems like shared vehicles or short-term rental of vehicles or bicycles at transit stations.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>higher cost rail projects only when there is an appropriate mobility benefit for the amount of funds to be expended and when there is substantial public support for the project, such as the Pasadena Blue Line, and implement less costly bus rapid transit in high travel corridors that do not meet these requirements.</p> <p>Implement universal passes or fare cards that can be used on all transit services across the region.</p> <p>Implement available advanced technologies that can improve the performance of buses and shuttles and that can provide real-time arrival and departure information to riders.</p> <p>Test the use of shared vehicles or short-term rental of low or zero emission vehicles and bicycles at selected transit stations to allow travelers to get to final destinations that are too far to walk to from transit stops.</p> <p>6.</p> <h4>Transit Restructuring and Efficiencies</h4> <p>The draft RTP refers to a study of MTA bus operations, which found that 20% of the MTA's bus lines carry 60% of total riders and that 20% of the least productive lines carry just 10% of riders. These, and other, statistics point to the strong and persistent need for transit restructuring within the region.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p>Transit services on very low performing lines</p>	<p>SCAG proposed transit restructuring in the 1998 RTP and still feels it can be part of the solution to deploying transit service operations more efficiently and effectively. Most recently, the LACMTA announced that it would begin to restructure on a limited scale. The LACMTA will look at giving some lines over to municipal operators for better efficiency in the future.</p> <p>The 2001 RTP proposes a program to help the transit operators achieve efficiency. The Regional Transit Task Force will be further analyzing these program recommendations in the future.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>and portions of lines and during extremely low usage hours of service should be reviewed for possible changes that would either result in increased ridership or that would eliminate or reduce these services or replace them with less costly operations. This would make available very limited transit operating funds for lines, service hours, and areas that are currently overcrowded or that have a greater elasticity of demand in relation to service levels. This would increase transit ridership for the same or less cost.</p> <p>The draft RTP notes that MTA provides service for about 70% of all transit trips in the region and that the transit agency continues to struggle to lower its high operating costs. Statistics included in the draft RTP indicate that bus transit operating costs per hour vary widely within the region, from a low of \$43 per hour for Foothill Transit to a high of \$99 per hour for MTA. Clearly, improvements in efficiency and a reduction in the MTA's, and other high cost service provider's, operating costs would immediately make more funds available for new and improved transit services.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i></p> <p>The 2001 RTP should call for a substantial, and realistic, improvement in transit operating efficiencies by those operators with the highest operating costs.</p>	<p>7.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p><b>CenterLine</b></p> <p>The CenterLine project in Orange County is currently listed as a baseline project in the draft RTP. OCTA CEO Art Leahy recently acted to halt all work on the project while the agency rethinks the project and reconsiders other alternatives, including implementation of bus rapid transit. The OCTA board concurred with Mr. Leahy's action at their regular meeting on March 12, 2001.</p> <p><i>Recommendation:</i></p> <p>The final 2001 RTP should list the CenterLine project with other new, and not baseline, strategic investments and note that the technology for the corridor, like several corridors in Los Angeles County, has not yet been determined.</p>	<p>The CenterLine is listed as a baseline project under the definition of the baseline determined by the RTP Technical Advisory Committee and adopted by the Transportation and Communications Committee. The project is listed in the FY 00/01 Regional Transportation Improvement Program, with over \$600 million for construction.</p> <p>8.</p> <p><b>MAGLEV</b></p> <p>The 1998 RTP included several major strategies that were relatively new and untested or, perhaps, overly ambitious; yet they were expected to result in substantial mobility and air quality improvements. Examples include a large system of smart shuttles and very significant transit operating efficiencies. Although laudable and appropriate for inclusion in the RTP, too much was expected of these strategies by SCAG's transportation and financial modelers. In just three years, SCAG has determined that the estimated benefits of the strategies will not be realized and is now looking for alternatives to</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>meet financial and air quality conformity requirements. The MAGLEV proposal may be headed for a similar fate.</p> <p>MAGLEV, like all projects, programs, and strategies, should meet performance and benefit-cost tests prior to inclusion in the final 2001 RTP. Project information provided to date does not appear to warrant implementation of this project during the plan period. Even though no public funds are currently committed to the project in the draft RTP, over reliance on its projected transit, traffic, and air quality impacts may cause the region to fall short of goals in these important areas. In addition, MAGLEV would occupy rights-of-way that could be used for other transportation purposes, so it is appropriate to consider its mobility benefits relative to other investments, even if it is privately funded.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p>Require additional evaluation and public input before including MAGLEV, even if privately funded, in the RTP.</p> <p>Require that MAGLEV compete equally with other transportation improvements for any public funds that may be requested for the project in the future.</p>	<p>Council. The Maglev Project Description further defined and tested maglev assumptions contained in the 1998 RTP. The Project Description concluded that on the LAX-March corridor: 1) There were no serious environmental concerns; 2) There was adequate ridership demand to fiscally support the private development/operation of the project; 3) The project can be overlaid onto existing publicly owned ROWs; 4) The project would have significant beneficial economic impacts; and, 5) The project would provide significant congestion relief and air quality benefits to the SCAG Region.</p> <p><b>9.</b></p> <p><b>Highways and Arterials</b></p> <p>The draft RTP notes that 98% of all person trips occur on the road network. Clearly, improving traffic flow and safety on this system will have a</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>great and immediate impact on the vast majority of Southern Californians, including motorists, carpoolers, and bus transit users. To accommodate the region's growing population, without significant economic and social disruptions, the final RTP should include the capacity enhancing projects proposed in the draft document, many of which have been carried forward from the 1998 RTP. In addition to new projects, sufficient funds must be committed to maintain and improve the efficiency of existing highways. One of the top concerns of cities and counties throughout the region is the inadequate amount of funds that are available for road and bridge repair and maintenance. As Southern California's highways and arterials age, more and more funds will be required to maintain and improve their safety and efficiency. And, a greater effort will be required to mitigate traffic impacts during the completion of major projects like the planned reconstruction of the existing 710 freeway. In addition, new construction and rehabilitation projects should incorporate appropriate ITS infrastructure to avoid expensive retrofitting at a later date and still provide for more efficient operational improvements in the future.</p> <p>Significant differences exist between the draft RTP and the MTA's draft Long Range Transportation Plan in the area of needed highway and arterial improvements. The draft RTP includes a number of projects that, in the MTA draft plan, are either absent, have a more limited scope, or are assigned to the financial</p>	<p>proposes significant funding towards ITS and ITS-related projects, including signal synchronization and a number of strategically enhanced arterials or "smart streets." For all projects in the RTP while SCAG identifies mitigation measures for construction, rehabilitation, and reconstruction projects. The implementing agencies and the local jurisdictions in which such projects are located are responsible for project-specific environmental review and mitigation.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>and schedule uncertainty of the strategic component. Examples of these projects are a number of HOV lane segments and interchanges, truck lanes, the 710 gap closure, I-405 corridor improvements, and the new North LA County freeway/metropolitan bypass.</p> <p><b><i>Recommendations:</i></b></p> <p>SCAG should retain the proposed highway projects included in the draft RTP and SCAG should work with MTA regarding the funding and scheduling of important components of the region's transportation plan that are not currently included in the MTA's draft Long Range Transportation Plan.</p> <p>SCAG, and the RTP, needs to provide leadership in identifying solutions for the region's mounting backlog of road and bridge maintenance and rehabilitation needs.</p> <p>All new major construction projects should incorporate available ITS infrastructure and should provide the maximum flexibility and capacity possible for future ITS developments and capabilities. Coordinated and progressive thinking planning, design, and construction now can save millions of limited transportation funds in the future</p> <p>Use adequate traffic impact mitigation measures to limit or avoid substantial delays during the completion of major construction, rehabilitation, and reconstruction projects.</p>	<p><b>10.</b></p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p><b>Modeling and Forecasts</b></p> <p>The impact of a new emissions model and revised population and employment forecasts highlight the inherent difficulty of making accurate long-term projections for complex and evolving issues. The 2001 RTP must recognize this margin for error and allow flexibility for implementing agencies to meet challenges associated with a dynamic future.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p>Whenever possible, sensitivity analysis, ranges, and options should be used instead of absolutes, fixed figures, and mandates. The model's margin for error should be recognized when reporting and using project performance projections and revenue and cost estimates.</p>	<p>SCAG's model is a tool to analyze the impacts of various alternatives. SCAG does recognize the model's margin for errors, and the impacts of the new emission model and the revised growth forecast. Sensitivity analysis and ranges may be used depending on the need of the specific project.</p> <p><b>11. Livable Communities and Land Use Strategies</b></p> <p>Along with ensuring that roadway infrastructure is adequate to meet the anticipated growth of our state and region, the Auto Club recognizes the need for attractive and viable options to the private passenger vehicle as a way to reduce traffic congestion, improve air quality, and assure mobility for Southern Californians. These options can include various livable community strategies such as land use, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, adjacent transit services, technology, and design considerations. To be effective, however, these strategies must be market-oriented, they must be embraced by</p> <p>The challenges of future population and employment growth and their effect on traffic congestion, transportation investment choices, air quality and housing needs are significant long-range planning issues. In response, SCAG has created the Growth Visioning Subcommittee to inform, engage and facilitate consensus on a "Vision" - a strategy for addressing the challenging consequences of anticipated growth in the region. Specifically, this Subcommittee will provide a policy framework for growth forecasts; provide direction on producing alternative urban form scenarios; consider</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>current and future residents, and they must have a measurable impact on traffic congestion and air quality.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b></p> <p>The final RTP should provide guidance to cities and counties demonstrating that land use-transportation strategies, programs, and projects should meet or exceed performance objectives that are linked to key goals such as mobility improvement and emissions reductions. Projects requiring public transportation funds should meet minimum performance standards. This will focus funding on the projects and strategies that can have the greatest impact on mobility and air quality.</p>	<p>balanced and efficient growth and transportation patterns; and consider other sustainable development and environmental issues.</p> <p><b>12. Goods Movement</b></p> <p>The movement of goods to, from, and through Southern California will continue to have a growing impact on the region's economy and transportation networks. The draft RTP includes a number of strategies that attempt to facilitate goods movements, reduce negative impacts on users of shared facilities, and charge freight transport companies appropriately for impacts and for new projects. The draft RTP includes truck lanes on SR-60 and I-15 and a study of potential truck lanes on I-710 and I-5. The cost is substantial, community opposition is likely, funding relies extensively on commercial vehicle-paid tolls that may not be fully realized, and the MTA's Long Range Transportation Plan</p> <p>In regard to project definition, an SR-60 Truck Lane Feasibility Study Final Report was published in November, 2000 including conceptual designs, preliminary environmental analysis, operational considerations, capacity requirements, funding,</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>includes the projects only as potential subjects for future study.</p> <p><b>Recommendations:</b></p> <p>SCAG and MTA should better define these, or alternative projects, the benefits they are anticipated to produce, and the means that will be used to fund them. This updated, better coordinated, and, perhaps, more realistic information should be included in the final RTP. SCAG should develop additional funding options to provide for goods movement needs within the region. Potential sources may include a freight factor for federal funds, weight and distance based fees for commercial vehicles, and user charges for new goods movement facilities. The RTP should include full funding for key goods movement projects including the Alameda Corridor East, the LA-Orangethorpe-Riverside Corridor, and truck climbing lanes on I-15.</p>	<p>community outreach, etc. A summary of the report is included in the RTP Appendix. The next step would be a PSR for this corridor. With regard to the I-15 corridor, we have an RFP out developed in coordination with SANBAG and Caltrans for a multi-modal, comprehensive transportation corridor, to include mixed flow lanes, truck lanes, HOV lanes, and recreational vehicle potential. For the 710 corridor, an Oversight Policy Committee has been set up with a technical advisory committee, both have met several times, and a consultant has been selected. This is the start of a 3-year study to look at mixed flow, truck lane, HOV, and transit improvements for the 710 corridor, and will consider early project PSRs relating to arterial issues. The 5 Corridor truck lane study has not yet begun. That is why it is included in the RTP only as a study.</p> <p>With regard to benefits, note that truck lanes are included in the RTP in order to reduce peak hour delay and unsafe traffic conditions relating to the interweaving of trucks and automobiles; to handle the growing numbers of trucks; to improve truck throughput; and to ensure continued vitality of goods movement, by moving freight with less congestion and delay. The 1998 RTP work included a benefit/cost evaluation of a number of highway corridors, and determined that the SR-60 truck lane project was the more cost-effective than an alternative mixed-flow improvement option for a 35 mile segment of the 60 Freeway; specifically, benefit/cost was 37% greater for the truck lanes as compared to the mixed-flow option, while ROG reduction was twice as great for the truck lanes as for the mixed-flow option, and vehicle delay reduction was 20% greater for the truck lanes. Other truck lane options including truck lanes on the I-15 and I-710 indicated a very high cost-effectiveness for</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>SCAG is also looking at a rail shuttle option for a route paralleling the 710 and 60 freeways to the Inland Empire, but it should be noted that the marine containers carried would only constitute a small part of the total truck traffic on SR-60. SCAG will not speak for MTA regarding that agency's evaluation of truck lanes; please see their Long Range Transportation Plan.</p> <p>SCAG is examining additional funding options to provide for goods movement needs within the region. The Freight Factors Subcommittee of SCAG's Goods Movement Advisory Committee has been working to develop and refine the way in which foreign and non-local domestic freight is measured and weighted in the federal funding formula for the National Highway System. This work coupled with other SCAG studies and staff research will generate a body of information that will be used to recommend changes to this formula and the means by which SCAG and others can promote these changes. SCAG is also studying the feasibility of such fee-based operations as inland ports and intermodal facilities. The RTP assumes full funding for the Alameda Corridor East, the Orangethorpe Corridor and the I-15 Truck Climbing Lane Project. Some funds have already been earmarked for these projects. The respective local construction authorities are responsible for securing the balance of the project funds.</p>	<p>these projects.</p>
B.I.A.	<p>Richard J. Lambros Executive Vice President B.I.A. 1330 South Valley Vista Drive Diamond Bar, CA 91765</p>	<p><b>SECTION V – STRATEGIC INVESTMENTS</b></p> <p><b>Regional Aviation System - Aviation and Aviation Ground Access</b></p>	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	909/396-9993 909/396-9846 – fax	<p>1. Included in the draft RTP was the 1998 RTP adopted aviation scenario (Medium Scenario) which served as a placeholder for the draft RTP preferred alternative. The 1998 RTP regional aviation demand was forecasted to be 172 million annual passengers in 2025. In order to accommodate that projected growth, we believe that SCAG's final aviation scenario should include the following: 1) incentives for the development and marketing of the Palmdale and Inland Empire airports (including Ontario International Airport); 2) high-speed rail connecting the various commercial airports; and 3) an innovative regional ground transportation system.</p> <p>2. We support the inclusion of an aviation scenario that directs future aviation growth to Palmdale and the Inland Empire airports, with the use of high-speed rail, market incentives and the development of innovative regional ground transportation systems.</p> <p><b>Land Use – Transportation: Livable Communities Strategy</b></p> <p>3, 4, 5. The draft RTP language is unclear about what is considered a "Livable Community" strategy in the context of the plan. In the 1998 RTP, SCAG described Livable Communities strategies as a toolbox for local land use planning policies from 1, 2. The currently recommended regional aviation scenario (designated 8) includes the three elements identified by commenter.</p>	

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
COMMENTS	
<p>which local governments could choose at their discretion. However, the draft RTP uses the term "Livable Communities" in several contexts (see page 99 of the draft RTP) and provides no trip reductions or associated emission benefits in the draft RTP. Recently, SCAG's technical effort to develop performance indicators capable of measuring transportation improvements through Livable Community strategies came up empty-handed.</p> <p>4. BIA/SC supports the draft RTP's direction to establish incentives - <b>not mandates</b> - to encourage the implementation of Livable Communities strategies by local governments, private developers and financial institutions. Further, it should be noted that Livable Communities strategies should not be meant to limit growth, but rather to encourage future development in the areas that are best suited to accommodate it.</p> <p>5. We request that the definition of Livable Communities in the draft RTP be rewritten in a more balanced fashion and that it acknowledge its limitations as a trip reduction strategy that is quantifiable to other trip reduction efforts. The draft RTP needs to settle on a single clear definition of Livable Communities in the context of the plan. Furthermore, the Livable Communities strategies section of the draft RTP should explain the reasons for the lack of consensus on performance indicators and trip</p>	<p>homes, shops, work places, parks, schools and civic institutions that are linked to pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly public transportation centers." Incentives that will encourage the implementation of Livable Communities strategies by local jurisdictions and subregions are being considered.</p> <p>SCAG's Livable Communities Subcommittee was created to address how to quantify "livability" at a regional scale as the impacts of the strategies are realized at a neighborhood or community scale. Currently, a consensus has not been reached for establishing Livable Communities performance indicators. Establishing these performance indicators continues to be a priority and will be pursued until a consensus for our region can be reached.</p> <p>The Livable Communities program will likely become a part of a package of land use strategies in subsequent RTP updates. The challenges of future population and employment growth and their effect on traffic congestion, transportation investment choices, air quality and housing needs are significant long-range planning issues. In response, SCAG has created the Growth Visioning Subcommittee to inform, engage and facilitate consensus on a "Vision" - a strategy for addressing the challenging consequences of anticipated growth in the region. Specifically, this Subcommittee will provide a policy framework for growth forecasts; provide direction on producing alternative urban form scenarios; consider balanced and efficient growth and transportation patterns; and consider other sustainable development and environmental issues.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>reductions.</p> <p><b>Land Use – Transportation: Location Efficient Mortgages</b></p> <p>6. We support financing tools and incentives to make home ownership easier and more accessible in order to accommodate the region's expected growth. However, while Location Efficient Mortgages (LEM) may make home ownership easier in areas with higher densities, it is simply not known at this time whether such incentives help reduce trips and emissions. Further information on dual-income households, telecommuting, and other social and economic influences will determine if LEMs do indeed reduce vehicle trips.</p> <p>7. We support the draft RTP action items relating to LEMs and the development of methodologies to quantify their affect on mobility and air quality. Furthermore, we welcome SCAG's desire to work with the housing industry, financial institutions, and local agencies to promote the LEM strategy in the draft RTP.</p> <p><b>SECTION VI – FINANCE</b></p> <p><b>Finance – Conditions Impacting Regional Transportation Revenues</b></p> <p>8. On March 5, 2001 SCAG's Long Range</p>	<p>Comment Noted. Currently the LEM Program is a pilot project in two counties in the region. The program will be modified based on the outcomes of this effort.</p> <p>6, 7.</p> <p>As local county planning agencies finalized their</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>Transportation Finance Task Force presented an updated draft Financial Forecast Plan to be included in the final RTP. This recently revised "Regional Checkbook" is significantly higher in both baseline costs and revenues as stated in the draft RTP (see attachment A). It is not clear how or what has been deleted or changed in the revised "Regional Checkbook" for the draft RTP. Additionally, we support SCAG's efforts to ensure passage of local transportation sales taxes at the county level.</p> <p>9.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Draft RTP fails to clearly state that it depends on a combination of public and private financing. The "Regional Checkbook" summarizes the cost of the plan, but conveniently omits the billions of dollars that it assumes the private sector will pay for a maglev system, toll roads and truck lanes. To illustrate this point, the draft RTP mentions the assumption of \$1.5 billion in private funding for two truck lanes on SR 60 and I-5 (see page 78), plus an additional \$2.06 billion in private money for new toll lane projects (e.g. a brand new corridor between Riverside and Orange County). The Draft RTP is also written in a way that lacks clarity as to the total of these private sector expenditures.</p> <p>10.</p> <p>The "Regional Checkbook," must be updated to reflect SCAG's Long Range Transportation Finance Task Force recommendations (see attachment A) and provide a more specific list</p>	<p>respective long-range plans, they provided SCAG with more updated information on both revenues and costs.</p> <p>Your comment has been noted. The project list in Technical Appendix K indicates total private cost.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE
			<p>of the private sector funding assumed in the RTP and its likely sources.</p> <p><b>SECTION VII – PLAN PERFORMANCE</b></p> <p><b>Transportation Conformity Analysis</b></p> <p><b>Findings – Conformity Determinations and Findings</b></p> <p>11. The draft RTP is an update of the 1998 RTP and its conformity status is scheduled to expire on June 9, 2001. The Federal Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the draft RTP to demonstrate that the combination of the transportation program improvements will not cause the emission budget, approved in the <b>1997 Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP)</b> by the South Coast Air Quality Management District (AQMD) for the South Coast Air Basin, to be exceeded. The draft RTP transportation conformity analysis for the SCAG region has been completed and demonstrates positive conformity findings (see page 127 - Table <b>7.4 Summary of Regional Emission Analyses</b>).</p> <p>11, 12. The Final RTP PEIR evaluates five aviation scenarios as well as the LACMTA LRTP; no recirculation of the PEIR is necessary.</p> <p>12. However, we are concerned that the conformity analysis is based on two major place-holders including the old aviation growth scenario and the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation (MTA) long-range plan from the <b>1998 RTP</b>. When updated projects are included in the final RTP and related emissions are factored into the transportation conformity</p>

ORG. NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>analysis, the conclusion may be different. This will require significant amendments to the plan that will likely necessitate a delay in re-circulating the environmental documents and result in a possible conformity lapse for the region. Second, even a positive conformity finding does not protect transportation projects in the region if the RTP is not adopted in a timely manner (see page 126).</p> <p>We suggest that the Regional Council of SCAG instruct staff to prepare a contingency strategy to cover the region should there be a delay with portions of the draft RTP being resolved among policymakers, or the full draft RTP not achieving a positive conformity finding. This plan would be essential if the region is to continue making transportation improvements until a comprehensive plan update can be approved.</p>	<p>1, 2.</p> <p>Much of the predicted growth in the region is anticipated to occur as a result of natural increases (i.e., births/deaths from existing residents) and not as a result of immigration (i.e., out of state or foreign). However, the region is anticipated to receive approximately twenty percent of its growth from in-migration.</p> <p>Additionally, as the region experiences increased growth, existing infrastructure (i.e., roads, water, landfills, etc.) will need to be upgraded or expanded in order to meet anticipated demand. The 2001 RTP's Livable Communities strategy addresses many of the issues associated with urban sprawl and identifies a number of</p>
<p>Bell, Dennis</p> <p>Dennis Bell 406 S. San Mateo Redlands, CA 92373</p>		<p>1.</p> <p>The Plan claims to need billions for transportation projects that will be needed due to projected population growth. According to a study released by the University of California, Davis this past January, 74% of California's population growth in the next 25 years will be caused by immigrants and their offspring, most of whom will settle in Southern California.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>If these people weren't here with more coming, there wouldn't be now, or in the future, as much traffic congestion, air quality problems, water</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>supply and landfill space pressures, housing and electric power shortages, lack of medical care, school overcrowding, urban sprawl with the loss of prime farmland and longer commutes, etc.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>The state and local governments including SCAG and SANDBAG, want federal funding for their mostly pork barrel projects, but don't want to comply with the laws that come with it. This includes federal affirmative action, age discrimination, civil rights, and labor laws dealing with federally-funded construction projects.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>This is how lawsuits get started charging violations of the federal false claims act regarding the above on federally-funded projects, including SCAG and SANBAG transportation projects.</p>	<p>policies and/or programs (e.g., Location Efficient Mortgages, etc.) designed to improve land use/transportation decisions.</p> <p>3, 4.</p> <p>Environmental justice is a fundamental expectation of the federal government in transportation planning, and it is supported by federal law, specifically the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As a regional planning agency and recipient of federal funds, SCAG must do the best it can to balance the expectations of environmental justice while also meeting air quality and fiscal constraints. SCAG's analysis shows that, in general, the 2001 RTP meets this goal.</p>
Bruce, Laverne	Laverne Bruce 31792 National Park Drive Laguna Niguel, CA 92677-2808	<p>1.</p> <p>We plan for open space. We plan for green space. We plan for central land space. We plan for quiet space. We plan for clean quiet space.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>We now have open space and we plan for open space that we may lead a quiet and peaceful life.</p>	<p>1, 2.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Ecology Center of Southern Calif.	Anna Harlowe Issues Coordinator Ecology Center of Southern Calif. P. O. Box 351419 Los Angeles, CA 90035-9119 310/559-9150	<p>1. SCAG should take the lead in improving our transportation system by supporting livable communities with compact mixed-use zoning convenient to transit and safe routes for bicyclists and pedestrians.</p> <p>2. SCAG should greatly increase the funding in the 2001 RTP for land use solutions to our mounting transportation crisis, as well as higher funding levels for transit, bicycles, and pedestrians.</p>	<p>1. A key strategy of SCAG's Livable Communities program is encouraging efficient growth patterns that promote alternatives to the automobile by creating a mix of homes, shops, work places, parks, schools and civic institutions that are linked to pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly public transportation centers. The 2001 RTP includes a number of policies that support the local governments' development of pedestrian- and transit-friendly livable communities.</p> <p>2. The challenges of future population and employment growth and their effect on traffic congestion, transportation investment choices, air quality and housing needs are significant long-range planning issues. In response, SCAG has created the Growth Visioning Subcommittee to inform, engage and facilitate consensus on a "Vision" - a strategy for addressing the challenging consequences of anticipated growth in the region. Specifically, this Subcommittee will provide a policy framework for growth forecasts; provide direction on producing alternative urban form scenarios; consider balanced and efficient growth and transportation patterns; and consider other sustainable development and environmental issues.</p>
Ecology Center of Southern California	Anna Harlowe Issues Coordinator Ecology Center of Southern California P. O. Box 351419 Los Angeles, CA 90035-9119 310/559-9160		<p>1.-4.</p> <p>See above response to Ecology Center of Southern California.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>2. SCAG should greatly increase the funding in the 2001 RTP for land use solutions to our mounting transportation crisis, as well as higher funding levels for transit, bicycles and pedestrians.</p> <p>3. Regional differences and political power trips must be set aside, and we must work together as united Californians to keep our state and our local economies strong.</p> <p>4. An efficient transportation system is vital to us all.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p>
Environ- ment Now	Kimberly Lewand Environment Now 2515 Wilshire Boulevard Santa Monica, CA 90403 310/829-5568 310/829-6820 – fax <a href="http://www.environmentnow.org">www.environmentnow.org</a>	<p>1. On behalf of the Los Angeles Livability Coalition and its members, which include, but are not limited to, the Natural Resources Defense Council, Environment Now, the California CoastKeeper, and the Santa Monica BayKeeper, we hereby incorporate by reference the comments submitted on the Southern California Association of Government's Regional Transportation Plan.</p>	<p>1. Comments noted.</p>
Freund, John	John Freund Westwood	<p>1. Maglev would offer an ideal solution to the Southern California region (and indeed the entire United States). Light rail is expensive, may not meet all our mobility needs, and is dangerous to cars and pedestrians with its street-level operation. MTA appears wedded to it, however. An overhead Maglev system could</p>	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Gault, John M.	John M. Gault 5337 W. El Segundo Blvd. Hawthorne, CA 90250 310/643-8158	offer a cheaper, safer alternative that would benefit all surface transportation in the region.	<p>1. When the city and county both decided to respond to the need for a public transportation system, I was appalled to find that their plans depended entirely on 100-year-old technology.</p> <p>2. I wrote a brief proposal and sent copies to people I thought might be interested in creating a better system. I have enclosed a copy of this.</p> <p>1, 2. A study of alternative transportation methods will be conducted in the next fiscal year. This study will help to identify the most effective transportation methods for our region.</p>
Hossan, Carole	Carole Hossan 7725 Hindry Avenue Los Angeles, Ca 90045-3225 310/649-69331		<p>1. I firmly believe that airport traffic should be spread around the southern California area; increasing passenger load and facilities at LAX will concentrate more traffic and pollution in an already extremely congested area. The cities of Inglewood, El Segundo and Westchester are already very adversely impacted by the airport.</p> <p>2. In addition to the proposed expansion of LAX itself, Westchester residents are also threatened by the "ring road" that would feed traffic to LAX, as well as a MAGLEV station that would bring people to/from LAX and Union Station.</p> <p>3. I find the regional solution to air traffic growth much more logical than looking to LAX to absorb the ever increasing amount of air passengers and cargo. Ontario Airport wants</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		more business, Los Angeles owns a virtually unused airport in Palmdale and former military airports could be utilized. People from Orange County and further environs drive for hours to get to LAX because they have to. Why not make it more convenient for them to go somewhere closer to home.	<p>1.</p> <p>Toll roads provide a number of substantial benefits that are not limited to the direct users of those roads. Toll roads provide additional system capacity, and reduce congestion on existing parallel and nearby corridors. Reduced congestion improves the region's mobility and air quality. Furthermore, with limited public funds available, toll roads are an innovative way to finance additional capacity. Environmental justice is analyzed for the total impacts of all projects in the Plan.</p>
Koontz, Christopher Ira	<p>Christopher Ira Koontz 10252 Lolita Street Orange, CA 92869-1801 714/606-0453 949/668-8084 – fax <a href="mailto:cikoontz@usc.edu">cikoontz@usc.edu</a></p>	<p>1. The RTP recommends additional and expanded toll roads for Orange and Riverside Counties. I would expect the final RTP to either delete this recommendation or to provide details as to how such lanes will benefit the general public and how environmental justice will be secured.</p> <p>2. The RTP should address what SCAG considers an acceptable level of environmental impacts.</p>	<p>2.</p> <p>The Program EIR that accompanies the RTP addresses environmental impacts of the plan. "Acceptability" of impacts will likely vary from project to project and by implementing agency.</p> <p>3, 4.</p> <p>Comments noted. However, Orange County currently is, and is forecast to remain (without El Toro) the area of the region that has the greatest shortfall in available airport capacity in terms of meeting local personal and business needs. In addition, an airport has been proposed and is currently being pursued by Orange County.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>The regional growth patterns do not show the density of commercial and industrial</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>development that complement an airport occurring around El Toro, to the contrary, the likely growth outlook for that area is residential and open-space.</p> <p>5. I find the lack of indicators and objectives related to livable communities highly disparaging. Such standards should be developed before the approval for the final RTP.</p>	<p>SCAG is committed to supporting and encouraging the use of Livable Communities Strategies. SCAG's Livable Communities Subcommittee was created to address how to quantify "livability" at a regional scale as the impacts of the strategies are realized at a neighborhood or community scale. Currently, a consensus has not been reached for establishing Livable Communities performance indicators. Establishing these performance indicators continues to be a priority and will be pursued until a consensus for our region can be reached.</p> <p>6. Based upon my own experience with Los Angeles's DASH service, I find it disappointing that the RTP envisions only a 6% increase in express bus route miles. It is unclear whether the RTP considers DASH to be express bus or shuttles and circulators.</p> <p>7. Freeway congestion may well increase transit ridership, but it is unclear whether the modeling</p>

The DASH is considered to be a circulator/shuttle service. This category will be added to Table 5.2 in the final 2001 RTP.

7 Assumptions used in the modeling process in the RTP take the congestion level of service into account with

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE
RTP			
			<p>used in the RTP considers this.</p> <p>8. An analysis of why urban rail has significant ridership (at least on the blue line) and commuter rail does not, would be helpful if not essential to future transit planning.</p> <p>9. Centerline is listed as complete in 2010 in the project list and as complete in 2025 in Exhibit 5.6. Considering the funding and political conditions opposing the centerline, I believe it is speculative at best to assume a 2025 completion date, much less 2010.</p> <p>10. Although I am pleased with the consideration of a Maglev project, the design seems misguided. The design should be modified to facilitate a more direct connection from Anaheim to Ontario, or an addition line to connect Anaheim and Ontario should be added as line 4.</p> <p>11. Airport scenarios 2, 8 and the 1998 adopted plan all make the unacceptable conclusion that El Toro Airport can operate alongside John Wayne Airport. The preponderance of evidence</p> <p>respect to the transit ridership. The transportation demand model includes travel time as one of the factors that influence mode of travel. Freeway congestion leads to longer travel times by auto trips and makes rail transit more attractive by comparison.</p> <p>8. Future studies will look at the feasibility of all transportation modes.</p> <p>9. Exhibit 5.6 is simply showing what the transit system would look like in the year 2025. 2010 is the year of completion projected by the Orange County Transit Authority.</p> <p>10. The Intra-regional maglev system includes a proposed connection between the central portion of Orange County and the In-Land Empire (OC-ILE). A connection to the Ontario airport is anticipated as part of this connection. It is anticipated that a feasibility analysis on the "Orange Line Corridor" (Union Station to Orange County) will begin in FY 2002. The initial feasibility analysis study on the OC-ILE corridor could begin as early as FY 2003.</p> <p>11. The issue of whether or not El Toro and John Wayne would be able to operate simultaneously will be the subject of future airspace studies conducted by the FAA. The FAA will make its determinations based on</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	indicates otherwise.	compliance with adopted safety standards.	<p>12. SCAG should only consider airport plans that include either John Wayne or El Toro, not both.</p> <p>13. When the consider of land-use compatibility, safety and environmental impacts are brought into light, a no El Toro airport plan should be selected.</p> <p>14. In addition to those measures detailed in the RTP, SCAG should recommend to its member agencies that they increase fees and responsibilities imposed on developers for public infrastructure. Not only are these developers responsible for the growth (often sprawl) that causes congestion but they will greatly benefit from expanded infrastructure.</p>
Kormeich, Don	Don Kormeich 657 P Avenue Sevilla Laguna Woods, CA 92653 949/206-0545	<p>1. Analysis of a potential PRT Mass Transit System for So. Calif. Through 2050.</p> <p>2. Unless I get some encouragement from you, this may be my last attempt to get SCAG interested in PRT.</p> <p>3.</p>	<p>1, 2, 3.</p> <p>PRT Technology is the latest evolution of “people mover” systems. Perhaps the best known example of PRT technology was the PRT 2000 system developed by the University of Minnesota and marketed by the Raytheon Corporation in the early and mid-1990s.</p> <p>There were two serious studies of the PRT 2000 in the SCAG Region. The first was in the early 1990s for the City of Palm Desert. The second was the City of Irvine</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>PRT will not solve the funding problem facing us 1997 to 2025, however, 2026 to 2050 it might solve our future regional funding problem for ground and air transportation without any other help.</p>	<p>Circulator study in the mid-1990s. Both studies undertook a serious evaluation of the proposed application of the PRT 2000 system. In both of these studies SCAG participated in the planning evaluations.</p> <p>Regional studies have repeatedly demonstrated that there are substantially greater economies of scale in moving larger numbers of people in fewer high-capacity vehicles (for long distance trips) than moving people in a large number of vehicles with small carrying capacity. The inverse is also true.</p> <p>In collector/distributor/circulator configurations (multi-modal station sites, CBDs, etc.) studies demonstrated that the more traditional transit applications (smart shuttles, small bus, trolley bus, taxi/van) were more cost effective than people mover systems. In addition the proposed systems funding depended upon a large percentage of federal capital investment. It is questionable that a PRT system could have been evaluated as a preferred modal alternative in a full MIS.</p> <p><b>1.</b> Comment noted. Many of the noted corridors are either in the 2001 RTP Plan and those that are not will be studied during the next RTP cycle.</p>
LAX Neighbors for Smart Growth	Daniel Walker LAX Neighbors for Smart Growth 7416 West 82 <sup>nd</sup> Street Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/410-9812		<p>1. We support various Light Rail projects and freeway gap closures, 710 Freeway missing gap, Expo Light Rail from downtown to Santa Monica (including bikeway), Pasadena to Claremont Blue Line extension, East LA extension to Whittier, Red line subway extension to Century City and Westwood, Green Line west extension to LAX, east extension to Norwalk Transportation Center (to connect to Metrolink) and Green line south extension to Torrance</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>2. We also support a Light Rail North extension from LAX to Santa Monica (to relieve congestion on the 405). Possible N/S corridors include Lincoln (along State Route 1) via Playa Vista, Marina Del Rey, and Venice) and/or Sepulveda via a Century Blvd West, Westchester, Hughes Center, Fox Hills Mall, Culver City, to link with the Expo Light Rail in West LA.</p> <p>3. Metrolink service hours should be expanded by buying significantly more cars and engines. New stations (i.e. Pico Rivera) and lines should be added (especially LA Harbor Subdivision link from Union Station to LAX to LA to Wilmington / San Pedro).</p> <p>4. Completing carpool lane missing gaps and connections between freeways should be given higher priority.</p> <p>5.-7. Most of those of us living near LAX strongly support making transportation improvements in the area. Keeping the status quo is the worst option. However, some residents are afraid of losing their homes to an aggressive LAX expansion effort. Some are concerned about noise levels.</p> <p>6. After reviewing numerous LAX master plan documents and reports it is my understanding</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Metrolink will be expanding service and route miles in the future.</p> <p>Metrolink will be expanding service and route miles in the future.</p> <p>The RTP considers HOV gaps a priority, and a number of HOV lane and HOV connector projects are proposed in the plan.</p> <p>Support for transportation improvements, including additional light rail service around LAX is noted. SCAG has performed a basic noise analysis for the purposes of comparing regional scenarios, but not to the level required under a FAA Part 150 study, or airport expansion environmental impact report. LAX has proposed lengthening the northernmost runways and shifting the northernmost 350 feet north. Please refer the LAX Master Plan/Environmental Impact Report for more detailed information. SCAG has no authority or control over airport development, however. SCAG did look at</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>that few homes are at risk with the staff recommended LAX plan. However, several outside groups are telling people that LAX wants to take thousands of homes. Because of these lies and misinformation, many people in the area are writing against the LAX master plan. Most of these same neighbors of mine, complain often about the current daily traffic jams on the 405 Freeway, 105 Freeway backed up from the Sepulveda (airport) exit. Everyone I talk to favors extending the Green Line Light Rail into LAX. A few more flights per day at LAX each year would hardly be noticed if the proposed rail and freeway improvements are made first. Transportation projects should be completed before the number of flights are increased significantly.</p> <p>7. Fortunately, newer airplanes are getting quieter and less polluting. From my office (just south of LAX) and house (just north of LAX) I hear that planes are much noisier during take off vs. landing. What noise level difference is SCAG using in its analysis? Some of the houses in Inglewood area under the landing path are affected by take off noise every few weeks when the planes take off in the opposite direction, east. Will the runways at LAX be lengthened to allow more western takeoffs over the ocean, where noise impacts are minimal?</p> <p>8. 37% of LAX passengers come from West LA (more than east or south directions). The</p>	<p>numerous aviation scenarios designed to decentralize aviation facilities and demand throughout the region. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports. Please see the RTP DEIR, Volume 3, Technical Appendix D, Section 1, General Description of 2025 Scenarios for a description of scenarios and airports under each scenario.</p> <p>Ground access airports are an important element of the RTP. For example, the baseline includes improvements to I-405, and the plan includes the extension of the Green Line to LAX. Ground access improvements should be scheduled in coordination with airport expansion.</p> <p>Currently there are no plans in the RTP for light rail around LAX beyond the extension of the Green Line.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>transportation link north / south in West LA must be improved significantly if we expect to expand LAX. The proposed LAX Expressway from the 405 is a great idea, especially if it will connect from the Marina Freeway area. The LAX ring road connection from the LAX Expressway to a westward extension of the 105 is another great idea. We recommend that all these freeway extensions include a Light Rail in the middle to help mitigate pollution and reduce the need for parking. Stations at Howard Hughes Center, Fox Hills, Century Blvd., LAX, and El Segundo would provide significant rail ridership and reduce congestion around the airport area.</p> <p>9. We also support converting the Harbor Subdivision freight train line into passenger service (Metrolink) between LA Harbor area, Torrance, LAX, Inglewood, and downtown LA Union Station as soon as the Alameda Corridor Project is complete. This valuable right of way, owned by MTA, should not be converted to just a busway or freeway near LAX.</p> <p>10. We also support an commercial airport at the old Marine airfield in El Toro. Southern Orange County residents will benefit economically with a new airport. A closer airport in this southern Orange County region of high population and job growth will also reduce the distance driven to the airport for many. Therefore, El Toro airport will reduce pollution and congestion in Orange County and Los Angeles County,</p>	<p>When further detailed studies are conducted for the ground access improvements, the addition of light rail in the medians may be considered.</p> <p>Parts of the Harbor Subdivision will have to remain in rail service for local freight after the 'Harbor Shift Date' of long-distance freight trains to the Alameda Corridor. This use would be technically compatible with Metrolink use of the line, or with light rail during the daytime and local freight at night as in San Diego and Baltimore.</p> <p>See responses 5,6,7 above.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Lee,	Jonathan Lee	especially on the 405 Freeway.	<p>11. LAX and El Toro airports are both located in very wealthy parts of southern California. Most of the areas around LAX are particularly wealthy due to its proximity to the beach and clean air of west LA. Conversely, the land value and income of residents near the airports in Palmdale and Ontario is relatively poor compared to LAX. Therefore, expanding these eastern LA County airports and not LAX and El Toro would violate federal environmental justice rules. Also, population around LAX is expected to rise about 20% over the next 20 years or so. It will make traffic and pollution worse if residents in West LA and South Bay are forced to drive across LA (through congestion) to airports far out on the other side of town. This will only push pollution and congestion further east into poorer neighborhoods. SCAG did not model how pollution is distributed to the more poor parts of town by the prevailing westerly winds. No significant airport expansion will hurt Southern California economically. Airport expansion at only the eastern LA county desert airports will hurt traffic and pollution, mostly in poor parts of Southern California. LAX should be expanded at about the same rate as the local population growth. Ontario and Palmdale should be expanded slowly as population moves further east and demand can support more flights.</p> <p>1. If, as one of the expansion scenarios</p> <p><b>1, 2, 3</b></p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Jonathan  8321 Reading Avenue Westchester, CA 90045 310/641-4893 <a href="mailto:Snon@aol.com">Snon@aol.com</a> (Letter came via fax)	<p>suggest, the airport is expanded 300 feet to the North and 3000 feet to the East, noise and pollution will become a never-ending part of every day life here in Westchester.</p> <p>2. There are alternatives to this expansion, such as sending more traffic to Ontario and other locations. Also, the more than 100 flights we receive that are destined for San Diego every day is roughly what the new capacity of the airport is designed to accept. Thus, if we just insisted that San Diego not re-route this traffic our way, there would be no immediate need for this expansion in the first place.</p> <p>3. Please reject the LAX Master Plan and instead insist on a more regional solution.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see the RTP PEIR. SCAG analyzed several scenarios that did not include LAX expansion. The currently recommended aviation scenario does not include the LAX Master Plan.</p>	
Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles	<p>Barbara Schultz Staff Attorney Legal Aid Foundation of Los Angeles Community Economic Development Unit 8601 S. Broadway Los Angeles, CA 90003 (213) 640-3974 Los Angeles Transportation Equity Network (LA Ten) "Barbara Schultz," &lt;BSchultz@lafla.org&gt;</p>	<p>1. We would like to incorporate the February 21, 2001 letter sent by the Los Angeles Transportation Equity Network, of which we are a signatory, into these comments</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p><b>2, 3, 4, 5</b> The decentralized scenario that was presented to SCAG's Transportation and Communications Committee (TCC) is not a staff recommended alternative. It was developed and presented to the TCC at the request of the TCC for alternatives that were similar to the four recommended scenarios but better optimized the regional aviation policies and guiding principles adopted by SCAG in the 1998 RTP. The information that was presented on the decentralized scenario was for information purposes only.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>PEIR. Suddenly, at the February 21, 2001 and March 1, 2001 Transportation and Communications Committee (TCC) meetings, a "decentralized" scenario was unveiled. It was presented only with a few slides in a PowerPoint presentation. The full 51-page explanation of the new scenario, now called the "Optimized Aviation Scenario," was not available until March 5, 2001, just 10 days before the close of the comment period.</p> <p>3. We are extremely concerned that, should this scenario be chosen by the RC, SCAG will have failed to meet its Title VI requirements; this last minute addition of a new scenario deprives the public of adequate opportunity to meaningfully participate in the process. We believe that consideration of the new decentralized scenario at this late date would also violate SCAG's own environmental justice policy that guarantees "early and meaningful public participation" as part of its commitment to members of the public.</p> <p>4. Aside from the process, what little substantive information we have been able to gather about the decentralized scenario also raises concerns in terms of environmental justice issues. On page 46 of the document "Towards an Optimized Aviation Scenario" a chart shows that the number of people affected by aviation noise of 65 dB CNEL or greater in the decentralized scenario, compared to a scenario where LAX is</p>	<p>and is not part of the Draft RTP or Draft PEIR. The TCC recommended Scenario 8 for adoption by SCAG's Regional Council. This scenario limits LAX to its existing infrastructure.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>capped at 78 MAP, will increase to impact 12,000 more people at LAX while at March impact will decrease by 1000 people (there appears to be little to no impact around El Toro). RTP Appendix B-63 indicates that the population in the LAX noise contour is 90% non-white, while March, for instance, is 58% non-white. Thus the net increase in non-whites affected by the decentralized scenario is about 10,300 people, while the net increase in whites affected is about 700 people. Consequently, the staff-recommended decentralized scenario, compared to a scenario where LAX remains at 78 MAP, impacts 14 times more non-whites than whites; 93% of those most negatively impacted will be non-white.</p> <p>5. Other scenarios that call for greater expansion of LAX would cause even greater negative effects on non-white communities. Comparing the 1998 Adopted Plan (similar to LAX Master Plan, alternative C, 94 MAP) to scenario 8 (LAX 78 MAP), the number of non-white persons affected by community noise equivalent levels (CNEL) of 65 or greater would increase by 19,000, while the number of white persons affected would increase by 1,000. Thus the burden of LAX expansion would fall 95% on non-whites (and disproportionately on African-Americans). This would clearly be environmental injustice. It is imperative to the low-income, primarily non-white communities surrounding LAX that its expansion be kept to a minimum.</p>	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>6. The SCAG RTP Appendix I has an extensive 31-page analysis of environmental justice impacts of the SCAG plan. It compares the impact of the recommended plan for various factors, including share of benefits (total travel time savings), tax burdens, accessibility, air emissions, aviation noise and highway noise. Relative to transit access to jobs, SCAG states, on Appendix page WE-19, Table WE-9, that under the staff recommended plan, only 2.8% of all jobs in the region are accessible via low-cost transit (bus or subway) in 45 minutes, compared to 15% via the automobile in only 30 minutes. By including the expensive commuter rail and Maglev, the percentage of jobs accessible in 45 minutes rises to 7.8%. Using the 1990 census data applied to the 3100 SCAG traffic analysis zone, SCAG has shown that these access percentages are similar for whites and non-whites, and for all income groups. However, the SCAG calculation averages across all people in a traffic analysis zone. Even low-income areas have many people with cars. Our concern is that the transit dependent, who are both poor and overwhelmingly people of color [87.4% of the transit-riding public in LA are "non-white" (LA Times Metro section 9/7/00)], are heavily discriminated against, in that a person with a car has access to 540% more jobs and services in only 30 minutes compared to a person taking transit for 45 minutes. In other words, if a person with a car has access to 100 jobs, a transit dependent only has access to 19, if</p>	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>they take 50% longer travel time. This finding makes it a clear environmental justice priority for SCAG and MTA to boost transit services.</p> <p>7. Aside from adding transit services, it is also vital that SCAG and the local transit authorities such as the MTA consider both actual costs and environmental justice concerns when choosing between transit modes. As stated above, the majority of transit users in LA are low income and/or minority, and the vast majority of these riders rely almost exclusively on the MTA bus system. The first priority of any transit plan for LA County should be to provide adequate funding for the bus system to ensure that enough buses are running to alleviate the present over-crowding problems, and that the needs of the transit dependent are met. Only after the transit needs of this population are met should the MTA consider building expensive new rail lines or expanding Metrolink (where the average rider's income is \$65,000).</p> <p>8, 9. Another issue that greatly concerns us is air quality. We question the accuracy of SCAG's calculations since they include projects such as MAGLEV and the Orange County CenterLine, which have no funding. (And the latter was recently rejected straight-out by local government). We are particularly concerned about PM10, which SCAG has calculated will increase by almost forty percent by 2025 (Appendix H-12). The death rate from airborne</p>	<p>SCAG has incorporated the LACMTA Long Range Plan which includes an extensive list of Rapid Bus corridors. Rapid Bus will mean more efficient, reliable service for all users. These corridors are proposed on corridors with the heaviest transit ridership, which will then be focused on the transit dependent first.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>pollutants is notably higher in low-income and non-white communities, making this a significant environmental justice issue.</p> <p>9. Our conclusion, in terms of the RTP, is that the air quality analysis must be redone with real mitigation measures, such as increased transit and non-motorized transportation, included.</p>	<p>1. The 2001 RTP includes \$720 million for NMT projects over the plan period, an increase from the 1998 Plan period. In addition, \$180.0 million in projects is included in the 2001 RTP baseline. Some of these programs include bicycle and pedestrian safety education, sponsorship of legislation and ordinances to promote a safer climate for pedestrian and cyclists, bicycle incentive programs that recognize and reward employees for bicycle use, and the introduction of legislation that provides for business tax credits to encourage bicycle use. Each of these is aimed at promoting walking and bicycling as effective alternatives to the automobile.</p> <p>2. It is recognized that non-motorized transportation investments are more effective in compact communities with a good mix of land uses. Thus, SCAG's Livable Communities program supports and enhances the non-motorized transportation program. While the subregions are given flexibility in how they spend their Livable Communities program funds, three subregions have opted to focus on bicycle-related projects during the 2000/01 fiscal year, one project being a new bicycle master plan.</p>
Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition	<p>Los Angeles County Bicycle Coalition 634 S. Spring Street, Ste. 820 Los Angeles, CA 90014 <a href="mailto:KENTSTRUM@aol.com">KENTSTRUM@aol.com</a></p>		

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE
RTP			
		<p>3. Nowhere in the Draft RTP Update are the "vision, goals, and objectives" stated, nor has the document completed any of the other requirements listed above for "Assessment of current conditions and needs, Identification of activities required," etc. The bottom line is that SCAG has failed to Conform to the federal and state requirements for non-motorized planning.</p> <p>4. In addition, we wish to raise a complaint on the grounds of environmental Justice. A large percentage of the pedestrians and utilitarian bicycle riders of the region, especially those in Los Angeles County, are non-white and/or low income. By failing to plan to meet the needs of these users, SCAG has failed to meet environmental justice requirements. Even though on page J-8 SCAG states that 9.4% of all trips are via non-motorized transportation and only 2% via transit, nowhere in the 31 pages of Appendix I on Environmental Justice is any analysis done of non-motorized transportation. For example, there is a table on page I-5 that analyzes mode usage by income category, listing bus, carpool, drive alone, commuter rail and urban rail, but there is no mention of non-motorized transportation (which has over four times as many trips as all transit modes combined).</p>	<p>SCAG has delineated specific actions for Non-Motorized Transportation. Actions address a range of issues including the NMT mode split, system status, goals, objectives and strategies, removal of barriers, integration with livable communities and transit, marketing and education programs, legislation, ordinances and incentives. The RTP encourages implementation of these actions in order to promote the integration of NMT into the overall subregional and local planning process and to move toward implementation of plans and strategies.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>5. To our knowledge, there was never any outreach for public participation aimed at the non-motorized community.</p> <p>5. Comment noted. A presentation was made to the Citywide Task Force on Pedestrian Safety for the City of Santa Ana, and this included a discussion on non-motorized transportation.</p> <p>1, 2, 3. There is approximately \$720 million identified for non-motorized transportation projects in the 2001 RTP Update. Some of these programs include bicycle and pedestrian safety education, sponsorship of legislation and ordinances to promote a safer climate for pedestrian and cyclists, bicycle incentive programs that recognize and reward employees for bicycle use, and the introduction of legislation that provides for business tax credits to encourage bicycle use. Each of these is aimed at promoting walking and bicycling as effective alternatives to the automobile. It is recognized that non-motorized transportation investments are more effective in compact communities with a good mix of land uses. Thus, SCAG's Livable Communities program supports and enhances the non-motorized transportation program. While the subregions are given flexibility in how they spend their Livable Communities program funds, three subregions have opted to focus on bicycle-related projects during the 2000/01 fiscal year.</p> <p>1. Increase funding of bicycle facilities: We strongly recommend that at least \$1.5 billion be allocated for bicycles and pedestrians in the 2001 RTP.</p> <p>2. Fund a comprehensive array of projects to achieve a mode split of 5% for bicycles: We strongly recommend specific targets for improving cycling. Reaching a mode split of 5% is a realistic, needed goals. To achieve this, we recommend that SCAG encourage and fund the subregions to implement the following specific actions: a) Increase funding of bicycle facilities; b) accommodate bicycles on all roadway projects; c) require the maximum integration of bicycles into all transit facilities; d) develop effective, well-promoted cycling skills training programs; e) promote cycling as transportation; f) prepare up-to-date Bicycle Master Plans with each of the counties; g) create easy procedures for funding small-scale bicycle projects; h) include Class III bike routes in planning and funding; i) support and adopt the Class III Pavement Stencil; j) encourage and support development of "end-of-trip" facilities; k) fund bicycle facility maintenance; l) fund and support the development and distribution of</p>	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>bicycle maps serving all of the county; m) monitor, survey and research costs and benefits of bicycle facilities; n) integrate bicycles with government operations; o) include cycling transportation experts on all relevant MTA committees and sub-committees; p) integrate bicycles with ride-share programs; q) educate motorists about how to share the road with bicycles and pedestrians; r) lobby Caltrans to implement bicycle-friendly policies; and, fund and support the initiation of a wireless bicycle information system.</p> <p>3. Appendices – Appendix A – Guidelines for the siting and design of bicycle parking. An essential component of using a bicycle for transportation is the availability of secure parking. 1) locate bicycle parking close to pedestrian activity or employee supervision; 2) locate bicycle parking to minimize access of automobiles; 3) provide secure bicycle racks; and 4) install bicycle lockers.</p>	
Mootchnik, Dave	Dave Mootchnik 7202 Stonewood Drive Huntington Beach, CA 92647 714/842-8766 <a href="mailto:daventbobbe@mindspring.com">daventbobbe@mindspring.com</a>	<p>1. Centerline rail is in the baseline transit table but when I looked at all the funding sources, they did not mention Measure M, so it was not all there.</p> <p>2. On page 37 of the draft RTP, Table 4.3 shows urban rail route miles increasing from 65 to 210 miles in the baseline. I went through the baseline list for all counties and the most I can</p>	<p>1. Comment noted and appropriate revisions have been made.</p> <p>2. Table 4.3 has been removed from the final 2001 RTP.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		find is about 50 miles even including Centerline. Also, Metrolink goes from 852 to 1693 and I can only find about 3 miles of new route miles. Are you counting route or track miles for Metrolink? Adding a third track on a route or a siding is not the same thing.	1-2. Please see Technical Appendix F of the Final 2001 RTP. This explains how SCAG estimated baseline operations and maintenance costs for Orange County.
Mootchnik, Dave	David Mootchnik 01/26/01 11:12AM 7202 Stonewood Drive Huntington Beach, CA 92647 <a href="mailto:davenbobbe@mindspring.com">davenbobbe@mindspring.com</a>	1. I am trying to understand Table 6.4 in the RTP, the Baseline costs, for OC. The spreadsheet seems to cover the RTP capital column pretty good. I get very close to the table number by leaving out the private costs in the spreadsheet.  2. Do you have a similar table for the O&M, Measure Tax projects and Traffic Congestion projects for OC? Of particular importance is the O&M projects.	1, 2, 3, 4. Comments noted. See Technical Appendix F for updated financial forecasts.
Mootchnik, Dave	David Mootchnik 02/18/01 11:07AM 7202 Stonewood Drive Huntington Beach, CA 92647 <a href="mailto:davenbobbe@mindspring.com">davenbobbe@mindspring.com</a>	1. This is a follow up to my earlier inquiry regarding RTP Figure 6.3, Mode Split of Baseline Costs, for Orange County. I was finally able to get a copy of the RTP Finance Appendix and the RTIP Tables.  2. Figure 6.3 indicates that the funding split for OC transit is 37 percent. I am able to replicate this figure by using the Table of RTP Baseline Costs page F-39 Appendix F and the RTIP Capital costs for transit from the excel spreadsheet of OC Baseline costs you provided.	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>- OC O&amp;M Transit at 4.52</p> <p>- OC Capital transit costs 1.64</p> <p>- Total OC at 16.496.</p> <p>- Then</p> <p>- <math>(4.52 + 1.64) / 16.496 = 0.37</math></p> <p>3. However I believe that there are several other transit items not included. Between 1997 and 2011 (end of Measure M), 30 percent of the 1.76 billion expenditures will be on transit items not in the excel table. This would make the percent devoted to transit to be 40.53 percent. Some portion of the Bonds 3.73 billion belongs to Measure M and some portion of that belongs to transit even though OCTA would argue it was for roads. But one could refute that position. My estimate for transit portion of the bond service is 0.3 billion. Any transit projects part of TCRP. I don't know what these are so I didn't include any. So my best estimate is between 41 and 42 percent is transit. Of course if one did not include the toll road bonds then the figure would be 55 percent.</p> <p>4. Please let me know if you will be incorporating any of these additions in the RTP.</p>	<p>The model is only a tool designed to aid the evaluation of system performance. The model has a number of imperfections that result from a variety of sources including oversimplified assumptions that can result in the model producing results that are not representative of real world conditions. However, the model is a useful</p>
Mootchnik, Dave	David Mootchnik 7202 Stonewood Drive Huntington Beach, CA 92647 714/842-8766	1. I have been looking at the file "Final Draft EIR-Second Part-(DayDelay-co) Revised ALL7" included on the disk. I am looking at OrangeDP Worksheet and see freeway speeds of 42 and 43 mph during AM and PM peak hours for OC	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		(cells C72 and D72). This seems unrealistically high. I checked some averages versus what is said in the RTP Table 7.1 and the worksheet gives higher numbers. I remember Hussan saying something about the speed numbers from the model are based high. Can you comment on the speed numbers?	tool that assists in comparisons between alternative transportation system configurations (RTP alternatives) and alternative population, employment trip distributions (aviation scenarios). Specific details related to the SCAG's model including its structure, level of detail, etc., can be found in a separate SCAG report, titled <i>1997 Model Validation and Summary Report</i> .
Newport Beach Environmental Quality Affairs Committee	Robert Hawkins Chair Newport Beach Environmental Quality Affairs Committee	1. There were not enough outreach meetings in Orange County.	1. SCAG has held 10 outreach events in Orange County since April 2000. SCAG intends to continue the outreach program in Orange County.
Realtors Committee on Air Quality	Cindy Baker Realtors Committee on Air Quality 4101 Sea View Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90065	<b>1. Pg. 97. Livable Community Strategy – Benefits of Livable Community strategies not substantiated in the text.</b> The Livable Community strategy provides no trip reductions or associated emission benefits in the Draft RTP. <b>Recommendation:</b> The Discussion of Livable Communities in the RTP must be rewritten in a more balanced fashion to acknowledge its limitations as a trip reduction strategy that is quantifiable and surplus to other trip reduction efforts. The discussion should explain the reasons for the lack of consensus on performance indicators.	SCAG is committed to supporting and encouraging the use of Livable Communities Strategies. SCAG's Livable Communities Subcommittee was created to address how to quantify "livability" at a regional scale as the impacts of the strategies are realized at a neighborhood or community scale. Currently, a consensus has not been reached for establishing Livable Communities performance indicators. Establishing these performance indicators continues to be a priority and will be pursued until a consensus for our region can be reached.
		<b>2. Exhibits 5.9 and 5.10 – “Activity Centers” are redefined without explanation.</b> – The Regional Comprehensive Plan and Guide encourages growth in and near activity centers to create	The activity centers are intended to depict the general locations of where the economic activities are most likely to occur so as to start the discussion linking these activity centers.

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>opportunities for transit and ridesharing. However, this draft Plan appears to define activity centers differently than in the past.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> The definition of “activity center” must reflect the full spectrum of such centers that actually exist in the region. The jobs/pop or jobs/housing ratio of an area is only one characteristic of an activity center, and not necessarily a precondition for an activity center.</p> <p><b>3. P. 105 – Finance Chapter – Private Sector Funding Ignored.</b> Just as the 1998 RTP did, the Draft 2001 RTP fails to clearly identify that it depends on a <u>combination</u> of public and private financing.</p> <p><b>Recommendation:</b> The financing discussion and Table 6.1, the “Regional Checkbook,” must be revised to clearly list private sector funding assumed in the Plan. The text should detail the type, timing and amount of private sector funding assumed for each category of improvements.</p> <p><b>4. P. 126 – Transportation Conformity Finding – Necessity of Adopting a Plan to Avoid a Lapse in Federal Funding and Approvals for Transportation Projects Throughout the Region.</b> The Federal Clean Air Act requires the RTP to prove that the combination of transportation improvements it recommends will not cause emission budgets set in the 1997 AQMP to be exceeded.</p> <p>The final RTP clearly indicates that private funds, in combination with public funds, are relied upon for moving forward with new projects.</p>	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p><b>Recommendation:</b> SCAG should take a prudent path and prepare a contingency strategy to cover the region during the interim if portions of the Draft RTP cannot be resolved among policymakers without extending the schedule, or if the full Draft RTP cannot achieve a positive conformity finding due to last-minute changes. This interim plan would be essential to allow the region to continue to build transportation improvements until a comprehensive plan update can be completed.</p>	<p>1. The majority of the transit projects proposed in the plan are in fact Rapid transit.</p> <p>2-5. Comments noted. Please see the RTP PEIR. SCAG analyzed several scenarios that did not include LAX expansion. The currently recommended aviation scenario does not include the LAX Master Plan.</p> <p>3. Virtually every project in this area is an excuse for LAX to expand (which is why the widespread opposition and distrust).</p> <p>4. I acknowledge that some of the projects proposed could have at least partial positive impact on the traffic and health conditions of the area, but only if there is NO LAX modifications.</p> <p>5. I guess we are doomed to even worse traffic</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Smith, Michael	Michael Smith 25941 Portafino Drive Mission Viejo, CA 92691	since any local improvements are seen by LAX as a green light excuse to up the cargo and passenger "baseline".	<p>1. SCAG data are derived from over 60,000 air passenger surveys taken at all six air carrier airports in the region as well as at Lindbergh Field in San Diego. Please see RADAM methodology in the RTP DEIR, Volume 3, Technical Appendix D for further information on how the model determined demand at each airport.</p>
Southern California Council on Environ- ment and Develop- ment	<a href="mailto:SCCEDmail@aol.com">SCCEDmail@aol.com</a> 2/27/01 9:26 a.m. Recommendations for RTP, please include Development	<p>1. Transit services per capita must be doubled. A number of key transit corridors also need to be added to the plans.</p> <p>2. Effective land use/transportation connections</p>	<p>1. The plan proposes a mix of transit projects geared at creating an efficient transit system. A number of transit corridors have been added since the release of the draft plan, including Avalon, Century, Crenshaw, Fairfax, Garvey, Hollywood-Pasadena, Soto St., Vernon-La Cienega, and West Third.</p> <p>2. The challenges of future population and employment growth and their effect on traffic congestion, transportation investment choices, air quality and housing needs are significant long-range planning issues. In response, SCAG has created the Growth Visioning Subcommittee to inform, engage and facilitate consensus on a "Vision" - a strategy for addressing the challenging consequences of anticipated growth in the region. Specifically, this Subcommittee will provide a policy framework for growth forecasts; provide direction on producing alternative urban form scenarios; consider balanced and efficient growth and transportation patterns; and consider other sustainable development and environmental issues.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>3. Expanded non-motorized transportation facilities, including policies, incentives and funding to stimulate increased usage.</p> <p>4. Expanded transportation demand management (TDM) measures, stems. TDM funding needs to be tripled.</p> <p>5. Additional revenues from a small increase in taxes on gasoline and diesel fuels, as well as continuation of the County transportation sales taxes.</p> <p>6. Limit expansion of LAX in favor of a</p>	<p>3. There is approximately \$720 million identified for non-motorized transportation projects in the 2001 RTP Update. Some of these programs include bicycle and pedestrian safety education, sponsorship of legislation and ordinances to promote a safer climate for pedestrians and cyclists, bicycle incentive programs that recognize and reward employees for bicycle use, and the introduction of legislation that provides for business tax credits to encourage bicycle use. Each of these is aimed at promoting walking and bicycling as effective alternatives to the automobile. It is recognized that non-motorized transportation investments are more effective in compact communities with a good mix of land uses. Thus, SCAG's Livable Communities program supports and enhances the non-motorized transportation program.</p> <p>4. The plan recognizes the importance of Transportation Demand Management in helping to reduce congestion and encourage more efficient use of the transportation system. The plan provides over \$500 million for ridesharing, telecommuting, vanpooling, and so on.</p> <p>5. The final 2001 RTP refines funding recommendations as follows: 1) continue using revenues from the state sales tax on gasoline for transportation purposes; 2) continue local transportation sales taxes where necessary; 3) adjust the state motor vehicle fuel excise tax and user-fees to maintain historical purchasing power.</p> <p>6. SCAG analyzed several scenarios that did not include</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>regionally-dispersed plan to facilitate economic growth in areas where population is fastest growing. The impact of LAX expansion would fall 95% on non-whites, a large environmental justice issue.</p> <p>7. Sustainability of the transportation system needs to be guaranteed for future generations.</p> <p>8. Improved air quality conformity calculations that do not include Maglev, and other proposals that promise air pollution reductions, until such projects are fully funded. We also need reductions in particulate levels, instead of increases.</p> <p>9. Long range plan charettes to produce implementation plans, including the greatly reduced world oil supply expected before 2025.</p> <p>10. An expanded, broad-based, public input process to solicit substantive public participation in and</p>	<p>LAX expansion. The currently recommended aviation scenario does not include the LAX Master Plan. Regional environmental justice impacts are presented in the 2001 RTP.</p> <p>7. Sustainability is one of the performance objectives of the RTP. Although the RTP Technical Advisory Committee was not able to agree on an empirical way to measure the Plan's performance with respect to sustainability, the Plan does recognize its significance, and SCAG will continue working on this issue for future RTP updates.</p> <p>8. Currently SCAG staff is working closely with subregions to identify local projects that are not included in the RTP, or projects included in the RTP but are not modeled for any emission reduction benefits. These emission reduction benefits are in addition to what have been shown in the draft plan. These additional emission reduction credits should be able to offset any shortfall associated with the absence of Maglev. The increase in particulate emissions is due to the increase in population and travel (VMT) in future years. The plan would reduce particulate emissions compared to the Baseline.</p> <p>9. Comment noted.</p> <p>10. Comment noted. The issue of transit dependent access to jobs will be looked at in more detail in the future at the</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Southern California Transit Advocates	Anthony Loui Vice President Southern California Transit Advocates	support for long range transportation plans. The needs of the transit-dependent must be met to meet environmental justice requirements.	Regional Transit Task Force meetings. The Plan includes a broad-based public input process that will continue to be improved in subsequent plans.
Southern California Transit Advocates		<p>1. We support the recommendations submitted in the paper prepared by the Coalition for Sustainable Transportation titled "Solving Southern California's Transportation Crisis." This paper was prepared in response to the disappointing set of dated recommendations brought forward by the Draft 2001 Regional Transportation Plan. Southern California Transit Advocates has given substantial input to the preparation of this paper with the Southern California Council on Environment and Development, along with other groups. We feel that the recommendations made by this paper are far more feasible and sustainable for this region in the next 25 years and can serve to make a better Regional Transportation Plan if these recommendations are incorporated.</p> <p>2. We sincerely hope that these recommendations will be taken seriously by your Agency, if not by the April/June plan adoption, hopefully by 2003 when the next plan update occurs. We look forward to your improvements.</p>	1, 2. Comments noted. The suggestions in the policy paper will be evaluated.
SPEED-TRAIN Californians for High Speed	John F. Shields Executive Director SPEEDTRAIN Californians for High Speed Passenger Rail		1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Comments noted

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Passenger Rail	<a href="mailto:Speedtrn@cmc.net">Speedtrn@cmc.net</a>	<p>even after having lost in its bid to be one of the selected recipients of on-going funding from FRA for the Federal maglev demonstration project.</p> <p>2. SPEEDTRAIN is a statewide, private, non-profit advocacy organization which promotes the construction ASAP of the California very high speed passenger rail system currently under study by the California High Speed Rail Authority (HSRA). While acknowledging the promise and potential of future maglev passenger systems, we advocate the selection of steel-wheel-on-rail technology due to its proven operation in Europe and Japan, its outstanding safety record, and the massive amount of technical, environmental, design, operational and maintenance data available to assist California in installing a superb, state-of-the-art high tech transportation system.</p> <p>3. SCAG should take advantage of the extensive momentum, technical and routing studies, and financing potential generated by its maglev project, to incorporate instead a high speed steel-wheel-on-rail system, such as the French TGV type of train, to enable seamless connection with the rest of the Statewide HSR system.</p> <p>4. We understand the Los Angeles area's critical need to resolve public transportation and air quality problems. While maglev trains could</p>	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>allow connections by transferring passengers to other modes in key stations, it makes much more sense to allow smooth statewide travel connections on the same trainset. Extensive market data from the French SNCF operator of the TGV, for example, demonstrates great ridership success with passengers able to remain on the same vehicle when traveling throughout France and Europe.</p> <p>5. We support a priority for the Los Angeles area to have one of the earliest statewide high speed rail corridor implementations, the LAX-Union Station-Inland Empire connection, plus routing to connect other airports in the region, including Palmdale, helping solve pressing airport capacity and population growth problems, plus a long-needed Tehachapi crossing allowing speedy access into the central valley. These implementations can best be served by a common steel-wheel high speed train technology.</p>	
Stanley, Tom	Tom Stanley Los Angeles <a href="mailto:Arranger77@aol.com">Arranger77@aol.com</a>	<p>1. The Plan as it stands now proposes to allocate too much scarce transportation funds on automobiles and highways.</p> <p>2. The biggest gap in the transportation system is the lack of rapid transit on the city's Westside.</p>	<p>1. In fact, the plan allocates about 60% of funding to transit. Improving the highway system will also bring improvements in local transit service by improving speeds and reducing congestion. The RTP proposes significant investments in transit, including expanded Rapid Bus service in Los Angeles and Orange Counties.</p> <p>2. The plan includes Rapid Bus Lines, rail and busways on the Westside. The current Rapid Bus demonstration</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>3. Funds should be committed as quickly as possible to extending the subway under Wilshire Boulevard to the Westside and Santa Monica</p> <p>4. I would also like to know why there is no mention in the document of converting some bus lines to electric trolleybus service.</p>	<p>projects on Wilshire and Ventura Blvd have shown an increase in ridership of 25%. The proposed lines are a light rail on Exposition, a Rapid Bus on Santa Monica Blvd., and a busway on Wilshire Blvd.</p> <p>3. The LACMTA proposes a Wilshire busway that is in the baseline; a segment will be in operation in 2005.</p> <p>4. The counties and SCAG have chosen to rely on other modes of technology. However, this choice does not altogether eliminate the possibility of electric trolley buses. In the next fiscal year SCAG will conduct a study of alternative transportation methods and will look at a variety of transportation methods.</p>
Stewart, Jim	Jim Stewart 1247 Lincoln Blvd., #253 Santa Monica, CA 90461 310/390-4366		<p>1. Page 94 states that \$180 million for non-motorized transportation is 0.8% of total baseline funding. However, page 108 states that the total baseline costs are \$110.5 billion. Therefore \$180 million for NMT is 0.16% of total baseline funding, not 0.8%.</p> <p>2. I agree that \$450 million is 1.5% of the additional plan spending of \$29.4 billion, but it is misleading to state that it is 1.5% of the total plan spending. I suggest you revise the final plan to state that the total of \$630 million in baseline and additional expenditures for NMT is 0.45% of total RTP spending.</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		3. In addition, it is misleading to say that \$450 million represents an increase over \$400 million for the 20% shorter time period of the 1998 plan. In fact, you should state it as follows: "The 1998 RTP recommended \$400 (\$16.7 million per year) while the 2001 RTP recommends \$450 (\$15.5 million per year)".	1. Comment noted. The Plan is subject to tight financial constraints. The results of our analysis of plan benefits for transit users (including low-income and minority transit users) do not indicate to SCAG the need to reallocate funds from other modes to transit. Regarding aviation, the plan proposed several scenarios for meeting future air travel demand. At least one of these scenarios does not involve expansion of LAX beyond its existing facilities. Such a scenario was recommended on March 1 by the Transportation and Communications Committee for adoption by the Regional Council at the time of final Plan approval.
Stewart, Jim	Mr. Jim Stewart 1247 Lincoln Blvd., #253 Santa Monica, CA 90461 310/390-4366	1. We have concerns both how SCAG has incorporated Environmental Justice and Title VI into the current regional transportation plan update, as well as how MTA has failed to adequately address environmental justice and Title VI in its Long Range Transportation Plan.	1. SCAG's baseline expenditure forecast reflects cost estimates of projected expenditures based on actual past spending. It is not a recommendation.  2. We do not include local streets and roads in the RTP.
Stewart, Jim	Jim Stewart 02/15/01 04:12PM <a href="mailto:Sccedmail@aol.com">Sccedmail@aol.com</a>	I see that the RTP recommends 12.96 billion for road maintenance. If you take \$25,000 per lane mile per year for 29 years, that takes \$8.9 billion, leaving \$4 billion for arterials, divided by 44,097 miles of arterials leaves only 3,180 per year per lane mile. Is that what SCAG is recommending?  2. How does SCAG include maintenance of local streets in the RTP?	

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
The Gas Company	Ben P. Pruitt The Gas Company 555 W. Fifth Street Los Angeles, CA 90013-1011 213/244-2522	<p>1. Railroad grade crossing improvement costs referenced in the RTP for the main rail lines east of downtown Los Angeles are based on existing conceptual plans. While these costs are intended to represent total public costs, they are not yet at a level of detail that provides for a meaningful breakout of utility relocation costs.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. Some portion of the utility relocation costs will be borne by the utility companies. Total relocation costs and the amounts eligible for reimbursement have yet to be determined by the agencies responsible for planning and constructing improvements.</p> <p>3. Obtaining funds for railroad grade crossing improvements, including monies for the relocation of utilities, will be the task of the subregional entities responsible for constructing the improvements. As indicated in the RTP, SCAG supports the subregions in obtaining project funds. The extent to which public funds will be used for reimbursing the utility companies largely will be a function of the specific franchise agreements that the utilities have signed with the various cities and counties in the project areas. With regard to the local benefits from rail corridor improvements, an additional major impact is motor vehicle congestion relief and the attendant air emission reductions.</p> <p>The Gas Company's central concern is the Strategic Investment for Goods Movement for Railroad Grade Crossing. While the Gas Company supports the plan's objective, we are concerned that the true regional costs have not been considered.</p> <p>2. The construction of grade separations to accommodate increased port traffic and train movement through the region to points east will require utility infrastructure modifications and relocations. The anticipated costs are expected to be in the millions of dollars for the Gas Company and its ratepayers if not mitigated through a cost sharing formula.</p> <p>3. The RTP should include strategies and actions to fund the required utility infrastructure modifications and relocations. These improvements should not be fully funded by southern California utility ratepayers to the benefit of other parts of the United States. Arguably the development of the Alameda Corridor East, Orange County Gateway and other main line rail corridors will improve safety at grade crossings and enhance economic growth in the region. However, the benefits to the rest of the nation are stated in the DRAFT report; e.g., "reducing the potential for accidents and possible disruptions of the flow of international and domestic rail freight to the rest of the</p>

ORG.	NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		nation.” (DRTP, Page 83).	<p>4. The final report should address the costs related to modifying and relocating utility infrastructure, and the need to adopt a policy of sharing all of the related costs (the project would pay at least 50% of the utility's required costs). Requests for grant funding and legislative proposals should specifically include funds for utility infrastructure modifications and relocations.</p>
Welsh, Christina	Christina Welsh <a href="mailto:Breezer2468@aol.com">Breezer2468@aol.com</a>	<p>1. Urge support of SCAG's regional solution and am against the LAX Master Plan.</p> <p>2. The growth of the airport over the last ten years has already had a negative concern for safety.</p> <p>3. Inglewood will be burdened with much of the negative impact of expansion – and as a minority neighborhood, this is hardly in keeping with the “environmental justice” issues that must be examined before any plans are approved.</p>	<p>1, 2. Comment noted. Please see the RTP PEIR. SCAG analyzed several scenarios that did not include LAX expansion. The currently recommended aviation scenario does not include the LAX Master Plan.</p> <p>3. At this time the recommended aviation scenario would limit LAX to its existing infrastructure, thus minimizing environmental justice impacts near that airport.</p>

**SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
2001 DRAFT REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PLAN  
PUBLIC OUTREACH WORKSHOP COMMENTS**

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
1. Tom B. Hawkins Senior Citizen Ad Commission 1073 E. 15 <sup>th</sup> Street Long Beach, CA 90813 562/591-8334	1. Seniors need better transit.	<p>1. The Southern California Association of Governments is concerned with the transit needs of all people including the specific needs of seniors. Our region will see a rise in the elderly (65 and older) population to 15.3% in 2025, from 9.9% in 1997. In updating the Regional Transportation Plan for Southern California SCAG has a number of goals guiding its proposed plan that will help to better serve this segment of the population. There are two goals pertaining to improving services for users of transit. First is the general goal of improving transportation and mobility for all people. A second goal is to meet the public's transportation needs in safe, reliable, and economical ways, which will meet the needs of those who depend on public transit such as the elderly.</p> <p>In the next year SCAG will conduct a study of Jitney/Shuttle Services. A Jitney service may better serve the needs of some seniors as they are on-demand personal transit services. However, jitney services face institutional barriers to implementation.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS RTP	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
2. Margit F. Chiriaco Rusche Chiriaco Summit 62450 Chiriaco Road Chiriaco Summit, CA 92220 760/227-3227 Fax <a href="mailto:JChiriacor@Earthlink.net">JChiriacor@Earthlink.net</a> <a href="mailto:Mchiriacor@aol.com">Mchiriacor@aol.com</a>	<p>1. I-10 truck traffic needs to create more lanes for trucks and passing. We also badly need public transportation between the Coachella Valley and the Palos Verde Valley on a daily basis. We do not need alternative routes. Rather we need to enlarge and modify existing roads in order to aid extensive and costly environment impacts as we recently experienced with the power line, right-of-way costs, which were half of the total costs of building, plus the delays were also costly.</p> <p>2. Need more public information available through well-advertised town hall meetings on such.</p>	<p>1. The comment regarding the need for public transportation between the Coachella Valley and the Palos Verde Valley has been noted. The RTP includes truck lanes on the parallel SR-60 corridor from I-710 to I-15, which will include two dedicated lanes per direction for trucks. Farther east, truck climbing lanes have already been programmed for I-10 between Ford and Yucaipa Boulevard.</p> <p>Truck lane projects that have been identified include the SR-60 (from the I-710 to the SB County Line); SR-60 (LA/SB to Riverside County Line); SR-60 (SB County Line to I-15); I-15 (SR-60 to SB County Line); and the I-15 (Riverside County Line to SR-395). These projects have been identified as essential to the region's continued economic competitiveness, including optimal goods movement and most favorable traffic mitigation.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p>
3. Paul M. Nawatka City of Torrance 3031 Torrance Blvd. Torrance, CA 310/618-2801 310/618-5841 Fax <a href="mailto:PMNowatka@TorrNet.com">PMNowatka@TorrNet.com</a>	<p>1. Alternative transportation should be pursued.</p> <p>2. MagLev project is questionable.</p>	<p>1. Given the region's problems with congestion and air quality issues SCAG supports developing and studying alternative means of transportation. In the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan SCAG supports strategic investments in rapid bus projects, commuter rail services, light rail and transit service expansion. SCAG also proposes the implementation of a high-speed magnetic levitation transport (MAGLEV) system, provided that funding can be obtained. Additionally, SCAG's plan proposes \$720 million to improving the non-motorized transportation network.</p> <p>2. The initial feasibility study funded as part of the FRA competition has demonstrated that the deployment of an Intra-regional Maglev system does offer a practical high-speed/high-capacity surface transportation alternative to connect regional activity centers and</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
4.	<p>Kimberly Collins SDSU-IUC 720 Heber Ave. 760/768-5510 760/768-5583 Fax <a href="mailto:Kcollins@Mail.SDSU.EDU">Kcollins@Mail.SDSU.EDU</a></p> <p>1. A linkage from the U.S.-Mexican border crossing to Highway 10. Currently, trucks must drive through residential neighborhoods to get to L.A.</p> <p>2. There needs to be a concerted effort to plan for the transportation needs of tomorrow within Imperial County. Rail should be looked at carefully as well as the direct link to Highway 10.</p>	<p>1, 2. A number of 4-lane, divided expressways have been planned and programmed to provide the linkage between the international border and I-10, including SR-7 north to I-8, SR-111 from I-8 northward, connecting with SR-86 above the Salton Sea. A Brawley bypass along the parallel section of SR-86 has been included in the plan. The remaining segment at Westmoreland is likely to be an item for discussion in the update of the 20 year Imperial County Plan; a Westmoreland bypass is possible. A Rail Vision document for Imperial County was improved by the Regional Council, and individual grade crossing improvements for the Imperial County have been studied. Many regional planning agencies, including SCAG and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG), will contribute to developing a regionally integrated truck movement system that will mitigate existing residential impacts.</p> <p>While SCAG has not proposed a linkage from the U.S.- Mexican border crossing to Highway 10 in the 2001 Regional Transportation Plan SCAG will be conducting a study of the Southwest Passage along the I-10 and I-8. Pending the results of this study it may in fact be determined that a linkage from the Mexican border to the I-10 is needed.</p> <p>3. I would like a copy of the plan for the Imperial Valley.</p>
5.	<p>Tony Rose 10401 Garden Grove Blvd. #54 Garden Grove, CA 92843 714/336-0013</p>	<p>1. MagLev/High Speed Train Orange County and Los Angles to San Diego</p> <p>2. MagLev/High Speed Train Orange County and Los Angeles to Las Vegas</p> <p>1,2,3. The proposed Intra-regional Maglev system when fully deployed will contain approximately 300 route miles that will connect Palmdale/Lancaster to LAX and Union Station, LAX to the March In-land Port facility, Union Station to Orange County, and Orange County to the City of San Bernardino/Ontario Airport. Longer-range corridors include connections to San Diego and from San Bernardino</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>3. MagLev/High Speed Train Orange County and Los Angeles to San Francisco</p> <p>4. Try to build stuff where people actually go!</p>	<p>to the high desert (possibly linking to the Las Vegas system) with a connection back to Palmdale Airport.</p> <p>4. Comment noted.</p>
6. Russ Dingman California Department of Parks and Recreation 1925 Las Virgenes Road, Calabasas, CA 91302 818/880-0377 818/880-6165 Fax <a href="mailto:rdingman@csp-angels.com">rdingman@csp-angels.com</a>	<p><u>Wildlife Corridors</u></p> <p>1. Liberty Canyon: Redesign or design new underpass so wildlife will not have to share the underpass with vehicles. The underpass should include native vegetation to provide cover for the animals. In addition, the underpass should be free of any lighting and should be free of overhead power lines.</p> <p>2. Las Virgenes: The use of native vegetation, the elimination of lighting and impacts of wildlife movement and habitat connectivity to Malibu Creek State Park.</p> <p><u>Water Quality</u></p> <p>3. Impacts to downstream natural resources in Las Virgenes Creek. Impervious surfaces increased runoff, which accelerated erosion, loss of topsoil and increased sedimentation. Impacts of petroleum products, detergents and pesticides, which may degrade water quality of damage riparian habitats.</p>	<p>1. The 2001 RTP Update PEIR is programmatic document and does not provide information in detail sufficient for project specific analyses.</p> <p>2. On pages BR-58 through BR-69 of the PEIR, mitigation measures designed to reduce impacts to endangered, threatened, or sensitive species and associated habitats are identified. Re-vegetation with native plant species and the implementation of wildlife crossings are specifically addressed.</p> <p>3. Water quality impacts associated with 2001 RTP projects on riparian and wetland resources are addressed on pages BR-58, BR-63, and BR-66 of the PEIR. Potential impacts to these resources and proposed mitigation measures including the implementation of Best Management Practices (BMPs) in order to control siltation, roadway runoff, etc. are also identified. However, given the programmatic nature of the 2001 RTP Update PEIR, project specific impacts, such as those identified for Las Virgenes Creek are not. Implementing agencies (i.e., County Transportation Commissions, etc.) would be responsible for addressing project specific impacts to areas such as</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP	COMMENTS
<p><u>Biota</u></p> <p>4. Impacts to native grasslands, oak woodlands and vegetarian. The possible use of non-native plants and shrubs, which may be used for landscaping within or around roadway medians. Impacts to the overall biological diversity and to the various habitats.</p> <p><u>Archeological and Cultural Resources</u></p> <p>5. The creation or expansion of roads, which may have the potential to disturb as yet, undetected areas of historic and prehistoric archaeological significance.</p> <p><u>Signage</u></p> <p>6. The elimination of billboards or unnecessary signage that block or taking away from the aesthetic beauty of the Santa Monica Mountains or coastal views.</p> <p>7. The placement of interpretive and directional signs to encourage awareness and visitation of the Santa Monica</p>	<p>Las Virgenes Creek.</p> <p>4. Impacts to native vegetation communities are addressed on pages BR-58 through BR-69 of the PEIR. Additionally, Tables BR-7 and BR-8 programmatically identify (by county) natural vegetation anticipated to be affected, including vegetation community type. Moreover, mitigation measures identified within the PEIR include the use of native vegetation (where practicable and feasible) for replanting disturbed areas, etc. Given the programmatic nature of the 2001 RTP Update PEIR and the lack of definition of the majority of projects, a project-specific assessment of impacts to biological diversity and habitats contained within the six county SCAG region (i.e., Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Imperial Counties) is not feasible.</p> <p>5. Pages CR-40 through CR-70 address impacts to archeological and cultural resources. Moreover, the PEIR provides a county-by-county analysis of potential impacts to these resources and identifies areas most likely to be affected. The analysis also identifies the location of state and federally recognized historic resources, known fossiliferous soil formations, an assessment of potential impacts and the identification of appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>6. Potential impacts from increased signage along roadways or other infrastructure associated with the 2001 RTP Update are programmatically addressed in the Aesthetics and Views section of the PEIR on pages VC-20 through VC-38. Potential impacts to dedicated Scenic Highways are also addressed.</p> <p>7. The placement of interpretive and directional signage to encourage awareness and visitation of the Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area will be addressed at a project-specific level by</p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>Mountains National Recreation Area.</p> <p><u>Road Maintenance</u></p> <p>8. Design and maintain a management plan for the cleaning of stromceptors, and disposal of debris from those stromceptors. In addition, the plan should address the impacts of pushing and piling stromceptor material over the side of roads, which introduces non-native plants to the area and damages sensitive habitat areas.</p> <p>9. Design and maintain a management plan for cleaning up landslide debris and disposal of landslide debris. In addition the plan should address the impacts of pushing and piling landslide material over the side of roads, which introduces non-native plants to the area and damages sensitive habitat areas.</p> <p><u>Aesthetic</u></p> <p>10. Removal and elimination of overhead power lines.</p> <p>11. Reduction of State Park Fees.</p> <p>12. When the Governor signs the budget, park entrance fees will be reduced by 50%, allowing more visitors to use State Park parking areas.</p> <p>8-9. Water quality impacts (including debris from debris basins) are addressed in the Biological Resources and Water Resources sections of the PEIR. The PEIR's Biological Resources section recognizes resultant impacts associated with soil disturbance and the potential for the proliferation of non-native species (including ruderal and other weedy species). However, given the regional and programmatic nature of the RTP and associated impact analysis contained within the PEIR, project specific impacts would need to be addressed by implementing agencies.</p> <p>10. SCAG does not have authority to remove overhead power lines.</p> <p>11. SCAG does not have authority to reduce State Park Fees</p> <p>12. Comment noted.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS RTP	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
7. Stephanie Pacheco Sierra Club OCG Co- Conservation Chair 18264 Santa Belinda Circle Fountain Valley, CA 92708 <a href="mailto:StephAC@social.rr.com">StephAC@social.rr.com</a>	<p>1. Preventing unhealthy air quality by offering non-polluting transportation – cleaner cars, convenient public transportation, etc.</p> <p>2. Roads should not be used to encourage development in primitive wildlife areas.</p> <p>3. In addition to a sophisticated system like MagLev, smaller vans can be less polluting and run more often than buses.</p> <p>4. I am very worried about encouraging an airport in the Los Angeles basin, which already has air quality pollution problems.</p>	<p>1. The objective of the Regional Transportation Plan for the SCAG region is not only to relieve congestion but also to improve the air quality and obtain compliance of the entire region with federal and state legislation. In order to improve air quality SCAG has recommended strategic investments in rapid bus projects, commuter rail services, light rail and transit service expansion. SCAG also proposes the implementation of a high-speed magnetic levitation transport (MAGLEV) system, provided that funding can be obtained. All of these investments would have an impact on improving air quality and mobility.</p> <p>2. Impacts on wildlife from road construction are addressed in the Program EIR for the 2001 RTP.</p> <p>3. In the next year, SCAG will conduct a study of jitney/shuttle services. A jitney service is an on-demand personal transit service.</p> <p>4. The adopted RTP Aviation Strategy calls for the increased use of existing regional airport facilities to accommodate the anticipated increased demand for air passenger travel. The Maglev system would provide a high-speed connection between airport facilities that would reduce ground access congestion and improve air quality.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
8. Joel A. Bloom Metro Eastside Review Advisory Committee 716 Traction Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90013 213/687-6571 <a href="mailto:BloomStore@AOL.com">BloomStore@AOL.com</a>	<p>1. Little Tokyo and the Arts Districts should be included in a light rail system that joins with the Pasadena Blue Line and an Eastside Corridor.</p> <p>2. Facilitating the Alameda Corridor after it reaches its northern terminus. Expanding a seamless light and heavy rail transit system. Repave Alameda.</p>	<p>1. SCAG supports the construction of the Blue Line from Union Station to Sierra Madre (Pasadena). This line will go to Union Station, where passengers will be able to make a convenient transfer to reach destinations like Little Tokyo and the Arts District.</p> <p>SCAG has recommended the development of an Eastside light rail corridor, which would travel into the vicinity of both Little Tokyo and the Arts District. This Eastside Corridor will link up with the Pasadena Blue Line at Union Station.</p> <p>2. The RTP includes a railroad main line productivity study which will look at ways to maintain or improve current levels of reliability and train speeds, and maintain long-haul rail freight competitiveness. The Plan also includes major grade crossing improvement programs – including grade separations – on the Alameda Corridor East and the LA-Orangethorpe-Riverside Corridor to reduce vehicular delay and emissions, lower crossing and train noise, and enhance safety.</p> <p>3. There needs to be a better outreach program. High Speed Rail from LA to San Francisco and Las Vegas could ease airport expansion.</p>
9. Quenton E. Hanson Palo Verde College 145 North Spring St. 760/921-3504 <a href="mailto:qhanson@paloverde.cc.ca.edu">qhanson@paloverde.cc.ca.edu</a>		<p>1, 2. Major freeways that could significantly benefit from separate truck facilities have been identified in the RTP. These corridors carry high volumes of truck traffic, which contribute to substantial peak hour delay and unsafe driving conditions related to interweaving of trucks and automobiles.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
us	<p>work, so why are you delaying real plans to improve those two roads now.</p> <p>3. You spent (wasted) \$5 billion on useless sub-way system in L.A. Why not spend money where it will work before unsolvable problem is created by inaction.</p>	<p>While congestion problems associated with truck movements do appear to exist on Highways 95 and 78, the funding constraint identified in the plan precludes prioritizing this project at this time.</p> <p>3. The construction costs of the subway did exceed cost projections. However, the line is doing well and has achieved a high ridership level.</p> <p>1. SCAG recognizes that the transit needs of all people must be met. Ensuring the equitable distribution of services may cause transit operators to fund some under-performing lines. Public transit construction choices are determined by land use and infrastructure, which can cause inefficient spending. The RTP contains performance objectives, such as cost-effectiveness, designed to optimize return on transportation investment.</p> <p>2. The argument for applying free market principles in the allocation of resources for transportation is not a new one. In fact, the nation's first transit services were originally private enterprises. Toll roads provide a way to pay for much-needed transportation projects in a time of limited financial resources, while also ensuring that those who benefit directly from the improvement are those who pay for its construction. The RTP proposes to complete the construction of the toll roads in Orange County in the baseline. However, there are those who argue that the only ones to benefit from toll roads are those who can afford the tolls. As a regional planning agency, SCAG is concerned with not only the fiscal constraints on the RTP but also issues of equity and environmental justice. The challenge is in balancing these concerns for the benefit of all.</p> <p>3.</p>
Craig S. Neustaeder  City of Moreno Valley P.O. Box 88005 909/413-3140 909/413-3141 Fax <a href="mailto:CraigN@MOVAL.org">CraigN@MOVAL.org</a>	<p>Misuse and inefficient use of funds available for transportation. Too much money is being allocated to transit and other programs that the traveling public is not using.</p> <p>2. Reduce the control of government over the transportation system. Introduce free market principles in the allocation of resources, e.g. toll roads.</p>	<p>3.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	Lacks a "bottom up" approach. Needs to be more compatible with County and City transportation plans.	For the 2001 RTP update, SCAG has made a concerted effort to focus more on a bottom-up planning approach. SCAG has worked closely with the County Transportation Commissions, sub-regional agencies, local elected officials, and members of the public to gather input on the Plan. SCAG has also worked closely with the County Transportation Commissions to ensure the consistency of the RTP and their own long range plans.
11.	Carl Caprio Focal Point Torrance 1339 Post Ave Torrance CA, 90501 310/320-1300	<p>1. Elderly and handicapped shut-ins getting affordable transportation to and from social activities and medical access.</p> <p>2. Devise a mini-bus to operate on a schedule to and from above mentioned, only to qualified citizens.</p> <p>1, 2. The Southern California Association of Governments is concerned with the transit needs of all people including the specific needs of seniors. Our region will see a rise in the elderly (65 and older) population to 15.3% in 2025, from 9.9% in 1997. In updating the Regional Transportation Plan for Southern California SCAG has a number of goals guiding its proposed plan that will help to better serve this segment of the population. There are two goals pertaining to improving services for users of transit. First is the general goal of improving transportation and mobility for all people. A second goal is to meet the public's transportation needs in safe, reliable, and economical ways, which will meet the needs of those who depend on public transit such as the elderly.</p>
12.	Edward Doty 4134 W. 173 St. Torrance, CA 90504 310/370-2140 <a href="mailto:tmndoty@mrinter.net">tmndoty@mrinter.net</a>	<p>1. Lack of regular scheduled inner city bus or vans. Access is a good start, but too limited and unreliable.</p> <p>1. SCAG's philosophy in developing the Regional Transportation Plan is to create a transit system that is available for use when customers want it, accessible by customers without major obstacles, and planned from the customers' point of view. The implementation of more Rapid Bus lines and the use of intelligent transportation system technology will raise the level of service provided and help improve the timeliness of buses.</p> <p>Furthermore, in the next year a study of jitney/shuttle services will be conducted. Jitney/shuttle services are on demand personal transit services that could create more transportation options. A study of this type of service is needed because they face institutional barriers</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>2.</p> <p>Get the neighboring cities to work together and pool resources. We need more 20 or less passenger buses. Have more buses with low entrances.</p>	<p>2.</p> <p>SCAG has recommended that transit lines coordinate fare structures when possible to create a seamless regional transit network. Additionally, it is proposed that on corridors and arterials that are used by multiple operators, operators should consider coordinated ticketing to enable “open door” policies.</p> <p>SCAG supports the use of buses and bus stops that are physically adequate to accommodate passenger access. SCAG believes transit should be accessible by customers without major obstacles (physical, institutional, or informational).</p>
13.	<p>Bea Virobik Focal Point 1339 Post Ave. Torrance, CA 90501 310/320-1300 <a href="mailto:bvirobik@msn.com">bvirobik@msn.com</a></p>	<p>1.</p> <p>More transportation options for the senior and mentally impaired. Dial a lift is not available in all cities and Access Services is unreliable and their drivers are not sensitive to the senior needs. Affordable rates.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Cities must cooperate with one another to transport people from one community to the other, not just stay within boundary lines. Using passenger vans not buses could provide more frequent trips and go more places, for example, cultural centers, library, churches, and community programs.</p> <p>SCAG has recommended that transit lines coordinate fare structures when possible to create a seamless regional transit network. Additionally, it is proposed that on corridors and arterials that are used by multiple operators, operators should consider coordinated ticketing to enable “open door” policies. In the next fiscal year an Alternative Transportation Study will be conducted that will focus on more efficient means of transporting people.</p> <p>SCAG supports the use of buses and bus stops that are physically adequate to accommodate passenger access. SCAG believes transit should be accessible by customers without major obstacles (physical, institutional, or informational).</p>
14.	Ether Wolford	1.

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Focal Point 1329 Post Ave. Torrance, CA 90501 310/320-1300	Affordable transportation for seniors with some mobility problems where bus services are either not feasible or too sporadic.	<p>The Southern California Association of Governments is concerned with the transit needs of all people including the specific needs of seniors. Our region will see a rise in the elderly (65 and older) population to 15.3% in 2025, from 9.9% in 1997. In updating the Regional Transportation Plan for Southern California SCAG has a number of goals guiding its proposed plan that will help to better serve this segment of the population. There are two goals pertaining to improving services for users of transit. First is the general goal of improving transportation and mobility for all people. A second goal is to meet the public's transportation needs in safe, reliable, and economical ways, which will meet the needs of those who depend on public transit such as the elderly.</p> <p>In the next year SCAG will conduct a study of Jitney/Shuttle Services. A Jitney service may better serve the needs of some seniors as they are on-demand personal transit services. However, jitney services face institutional barriers to implementation.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>SCAG's Regional Transit Task Force recognizes the need for having bus lines from neighboring areas linked. As a result the Task Force suggests that regional transit providers and municipal operators be required to coordinate transit services and fare systems where jurisdictional boundaries are crossed.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Shuttle transportation from various areas to established bus lines, more frequent schedules to major areas (malls, civic centers, hospitals, etc.)</p>
15.	J.P. Page Focal Point 1339 Post Ave. Torrance, CA 90501	<p>1.</p> <p>The inability of persons living in one community to get transportation across boundary lines to adjoining communities is the most important transportation issue.</p> <p>1.</p> <p>SCAG's Regional Transit Task Force suggests that in order to improve service regional transit providers and municipal operators should coordinate transit services and fare systems where jurisdictional boundaries are crossed. For example it is recommended that on corridors or arterials that are used by multiple operators, operators consider coordinated ticketing to enable "open door" policies.</p>
16.	Edward C. Price Focal Point	<p>1.</p> <p>My wife is legally blind, and depends on</p> <p>1.</p> <p>Please refer to reply given to comment #11.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
4214 "176 <sup>th</sup> Street Torrance, CA 90504-3126 310/371-8827	<p>me for most of her transportation. We have many calls at Focal Point for market (grocery) transportation.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>More mini-vans cross hatching areas and more implementation of intra city pass.</p>	<p>2.</p> <p>A study of jitney/shuttle services and other alternative transportation methods will be conducted in the next year. This study will help us to better understand the market for these services as well as the needed infrastructure to improve service.</p> <p>In regards to intra city passes, SCAG has made a number of recommendations encouraging transit providers to create a seamless regional transit network. For example it is recommended that on corridors or arterials that are used by multiple operators, operators should consider coordinated ticketing to enable "open door" policies.</p>
17.	<p>Eleanor Lindenfield League of Women Voters of Downey 8856 S. Manzanas Downey, CA 90240 562/862-4968</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>I – 5 widening is most important transportation issue.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Trucks need their own roads. They travel to east and cut through residential streets. Freeways need to be underground level due to noise and pollution.</p>
18.	<p>Pauline Hods Focal Point 310/320-1300</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>Transportation offered by South Bay Area Cities only allows for destination within</p> <p>1, 2, 3.</p> <p>SCAG's Regional Transit Task Force recognizes the need for better coordination among transit providers. The Task Force suggests that</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>that city. This creates a big problem for older adults in getting to doctors, hospitals and other health matters located outside the area they are living in.</p> <p>2. Another need for older adults is to have transportation out of area they live in to be able to avail themselves of cultural and educational outlets to keep themselves stimulated and fulfilled.</p> <p>3. The seniors would like a more integrated transportation system between South Bay cities. There is too much confusion and boundary lines when it comes to transportation. Is it possible to create a system which allows seniors to go from one city to another and require only one voucher?</p>	<p>to improve service, regional transit providers and municipal operators should be required to coordinate transit services and fare systems where jurisdictional boundaries are crossed. Additionally, it is recommended that fare structures be coordinated when possible to create a seamless regional transit network.</p> <p>1. SCAG recognizes the need for a jobs/housing balance in the region and the strategies to achieve this goal look to develop housing in urban and suburban job centers while attracting high paying jobs to housing-rich communities. As part of the Integrated Land Use, Transportation, and General Planning section, of the 2001 RTP, SCAG will help member jurisdictions apply for Jobs/Housing incentive funds from the State Department of Housing and Community Development. Also, SCAG's 2001/02 Overall Work Program includes a new Regional Housing Development program aimed at promoting more housing in jobs-rich areas.</p>
19. East Culver City Neighborhood Alliance Member Survey Number 34		<p>1. Biggest challenge to transportation in my subregion is a lousy jobs/ housing balance.</p>
20. East Culver City Neighborhood Alliance		<p>1. Increasing ridership of public transit is needed in the entire SCAG</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Member Survey Number 35	subregion is getting people to ride transit.	<p>region. In order to boost ridership SCAG believes that transit must be accessible without major obstacles (physical, institutional, or informational). Transit services need to be available for use when the customers want to use them. Also transit should be planned from the customer's point of view. Furthermore, SCAG's transit task force suggests that transit should be more aggressively marketed.</p>
21. East Culver City Neighborhood Alliance Member Survey Number 37	<p>1. Biggest challenge to transportation in my subregion is to get relief for surface traffic jam.</p>	<p>1. As freeway growth becomes constrained, maximizing the potential capacity of arterials (surface streets) becomes an attractive option to increase overall system capacity in already-developed areas. Currently, arterial roads account for over 65% of the total road network and carry over 50% of total traffic. SCAG proposes the Strategic Arterial Improvement concept which could include a combination of widening arterials, signal prioritization and other Intelligent Transportation Systems deployment and grade separation at critically high-volume intersections to enhance the flow of speed and the capacity of the arterial. It is estimated that such improvements could increase arterial capacity by as much as 50%.</p> <p>2. SCAG has proposed several other measures that would help to relieve congestion in Culver City area. Under consideration is the construction of a West Side Light Rail line. A more immediate response to congestion in the area is the proposal for the deployment of rapid buses. Additionally, SCAG recommends aggressive marketing of transit services. These recommendations would help to relieve congestion on arterials by getting people out of their cars and using public transit.</p>
22. East Culver City Neighborhood Alliance	<p>1. Light rail has a positive impact on our communities.</p> <p>2. I support transit improvements; the</p>	<p>1, 2 It is SCAG's position that many of the existing rail lines should be extended and should provide more frequent service. An additional line is also planned for the Westside to create a better network of rail for the region and give people an option to using the freeway.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	3. Transit has negative connotations.  4. How will the Governor's money affect transit?	<p>3. Many of the actions SCAG has proposed in the Regional Transportation Plan will help combat negative associations with transit. These improvements range from ensuring that buses arrive within five minutes of the time printed on the transit schedule, providing security for park and ride facilities, as well as more aggressive marketing of these transit services to make people aware of there transportation options.</p> <p>4. The 2001 RTP incorporates the Governor's Congestion relief plan, which allocates \$1.1 billion to transit over the next 6 years.</p>
23. Wendy Brogin Brogin Cos. Of California 5043 Matilija Avenue 818/906-2136	1. Improved road and building identification/signage.	<p>1. Road and building identification/signage comes under the authority of a variety of public agencies like Caltrans. Clear road and building identification is important and can play a secondary role in improving mobility on our highways and arterials.</p>
24. Leticia Gutierrez IID 6321 S. Easter Avenue Brawley 909/339-9234	1. Pollution and air quality.  2. Maybe use a carpool to work.	<p>1,3. The RTP sets forth a long-range plan for transportation improvements that address regional concerns such as mobility, accessibility, safety, and air quality.</p> <p>2. Currently, carpooling is the number one alternative to driving alone in the Los Angeles area. As of the 1990 Census, carpooling moved over three times more workers each day than transit. Los Angeles is the only major metropolitan area in the nation where carpooling has been maintaining its relative market share. As a result SCAG not only calls for the extension of existing High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes but the creation of new lanes. The 2001 Regional Transportation Plan calls for a 3% increase in HOV lane miles, over the proposed baseline improvements of 1,194 HOV lane miles.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
25.	Barbara Cameron	<p>3. The RTP is obviously an important program.</p> <p>1. Avoidable traffic tie-ups that create hazards.</p>
26.	Marcia Rybak Malibu Knolls 23722 Harbor Vista 310/456-8332 310/456-5681 Fax	<p>1. Z Traffic and beach traffic on Malibu Canyon Road is a problem. Specifically no break in traffic flow to allow ingress and egress into Malibu Knolls area.</p> <p>2. Traffic light at Hughes Research and break in traffic from Oceanside coming up Malibu Canyon. Perhaps, control the continuous right-hand turn from Civic Center onto Malibu Canyon.</p>
27.	Joan Rickabaugh Paradise Cove Homeowners Assn. 165 Paradise Circle Malibu, CA 90265 310/457-4229	<p>1. My home is along Pacific Coast Highway. Weekends we have hundred of noisy motorcycles which speed and are illegally non baffled. Bumper to bumper traffic fills our homes with gas fumes/dirt. Speed, noise and air pollution are my concerns.</p> <p>2. Pacific Coast Highway and checkpoints for motorcycles (site for noise). Bikes should be outlawed. PCH is too dangerous for</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	bikers. More speed signs. Ventura Freeway needs a rail system; would lift Z Traffic from Pacific Coast Highway.	3. Would like information on sound walls.
28.	Edward Gonzalez, PhD 3601 Vista Pacifica, Unit 11 Malibu, CA 90265 310/456-9756	1. Concerns regarding “preventable” traffic tie-ups on Pacific Coast Highway. Suggestions for improvement include: 1) use median as a traffic lane when an existing travel lane requires closure, 2) if no median exists to create a temporary traffic lane and limit travel lane closures to essential work crews only (no closures for film productions).
29.	David M. Kramer 6841 Dume Drive Malibu, CA 90265 <a href="mailto:DMKRAMER2@aol.com">DMKRAMER2@aol.com</a>	1. Suggestion was made to create “Licensed Traffic Directors” whose responsibility would be to keep traffic safely moving during emergencies and other needed times, especially in Malibu.
30.	Marilyn Dove <a href="mailto:Marilyn.Dove@HSC.com">Marilyn.Dove@HSC.com</a>	1. Regarding SCAG, my input is that we should not sacrifice any wide shoulders currently existing on PCH or Malibu Canyon Road. These shoulders are heavily used for biking and in some places parking.
31.	Georgianna McBurney Vista Pacific Home Owners	1. Cited specific concerns regarding “Z” 1. Please see response to comment 25.

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE	RTP
Assn. SMTTP:ganch@earthlink.net	traffic" (along Malibu Canyon road between Highway 101 and Pacific Coast Highway and other traffic problems near Civic Center Way.	1. Specific concerns cited including: 1) speed along Pacific Coast Highway (too fast— suggests photo ticketing), 2) U-turns along Pacific Coast Highway are dangerous and should not be permitted, 3) a crosswalk at Pacific Coast Highway and Zunirez needs to be installed, especially since a bus stop is located nearby, 4) street striping needs to be redone, as it is currently too confusing, and 5) corner of Cliffside Drive and Fernhill (Point Dume) is dangerous, a three-way stop sign should be installed.	1. Please see response to comment 25.  SCAG believes that better marketing of transit services will help to achieve this goal.  2. Comment noted.  3. Advocate use of "Smart Shuttle."
32. Cindy O'Shea 310/457-6410			
33. Arthur E. Eck Superintendent United States Department of the Interior National Park Service Santa Monica Mountains National Recreation Area 401 West Hillcrest Drive Thousand Oaks, CA 91360- 4207 805-370-2347		1. Encourage alternative transportation system use to reduce vehicle trips to park areas.  2. Pressing concern is lack of public transportation servicing canyon roads transecting the Santa Monica Mountains along PCH and 101.  3. Advocate use of "Smart Shuttle."	1. The RTP recognizes the importance of the Orange County—Riverside County corridor and has identified the need for additional capacity in this area.
34. Christina Shea Mayor City of Irvine One Civic Center Plaza		1. Encouraged the efforts to pursue a regional highway corridor linking Orange County and the Inland Empire, especially since the	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
PO Box 19575 Irvine, California 92623- 9575 949-724-6000	probability of expanding and improving Ortega Highway is doubtful.	<p>1, 2, 3.</p> <p>SCAG is committed to supporting and encouraging the use of non-motorized transportation which consists primarily of bicycling, walking and jogging. This is evident in the focus on Livable Communities Strategy. An important aspect of creating sustainable, livable communities is making them both pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly. SCAG's Livable Communities Subcommittee was created to address how to quantify "livability" at a regional scale as the impacts of the strategies are realized at a neighborhood or community scale.</p> <p>A key strategy of SCAG's Livable Communities program is encouraging efficient growth patterns that promote alternatives to the automobile by creating a mix of homes, shops, work places, parks and civic institutions that are linked to pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly public transportation centers. The Draft 2001 RTP Update includes a number of policies that support the local governments' development of pedestrian- and transit-friendly livable communities. The plan intends to establish incentives to encourage the implementation of livable communities' strategies and transit-oriented development by local governments and subregions, private developers, and financial institutions and implement a legislative strategy to support livable communities' goals.</p> <p>SCAG'S commitment to increased use of non-motorized transportation in the region is also evident in the proposed spending in the 2001 RTP. In the Strategic Investments section, SCAG has recommended eight actions specifically designed to encourage the use of non-motorized transportation.</p>
35. Julie Garner Sierra Club 12441 Merrill Street Garden Grove, CA 92840	<p>1. The dominance of the automobile to the exclusion of other forms of transportation and to the detriment of communities.</p> <p>2. Emphasis on sustainable, livable communities which are pedestrian and bike friendly – more bike lane and sidewalks rather than increased roads.</p> <p>3. Increased emphasis of alternative modes of transportation – bicycles and walking locally and buses and high speed trains between regions.</p>	1,2.

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
EJ Community Dialogue Lancaster - North LA County 10:00 – 11:00 a.m.	<p>Hire more people for bus drivers.</p> <p>2. Need to extend bus system.</p> <p>3. Transportation really bad.</p> <p>4. Should only do construction at night.</p>	<p>This will be necessary as we begin expanding our current bus system with new transit corridors and the expansion of service.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>4, 6. SCAG supports the idea that construction should be scheduled to minimize congestion.</p> <p>The development of a single lane for the exclusive use of emergency vehicles would probably not be financially feasible. Perhaps a more viable solution would be the closing of gaps in shoulders that can be used by emergency vehicles.</p> <p>5. All service is proposed to increase as our population grows in the future.</p> <p>5. Scheduling other than business commuters, too big of gaps. Evenings/Sundays better service.</p> <p>6. Work on roads at night have buses run more. Have one lane for emergency vehicles.</p> <p>7. Need to increase times for AVTA and Metrolink as well as available on Sundays. One week passes would be nice, too.</p>
37. Anthony Curzi Southern California Transit Advocates 15424 Camarillo Street	<p>1. Too much focus on highways &amp; roads. Not enough on mass transit.</p>	<p>1,2. The 2001 RTP allocates approximately 60% of funding to transit, even though transit carries a far smaller share of trips.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>Sherman Oaks, CA 91403 818/981-1027</p> <p>2. Major investment in mass transit – bus, light-rail train, regional rail, MagLev. Encourage “smart growth” regional-wide.</p> <p>A key strategy of SCAG’s Livable Communities program is encouraging efficient growth patterns that promote alternatives to the automobile by creating a mix of homes, shops, work places, parks and civic institutions that are linked to pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly public transportation centers. The Draft 2001 RTP Update includes a number of policies that support the local governments’ development of pedestrian- and transit-friendly livable communities. The plan intends to establish incentives to encourage the implementation of livable communities’ strategies and transit-oriented development by local governments and subregions, private developers, and financial institutions and implement a legislative strategy to support livable communities’ goals.</p> <p>3. Industry experts recognize that short distance (under 400 mile) rail cargo shipments are unfeasible except for special circumstances, because of costs, transit time, lack of local rail spurs to most shippers, and need for costly transloading between trucks and trains. To address long-haul freight markets, the Plan endorses measures to ensure that rail cargo moves through the region swiftly and reliably, and that truck diversion to rail will take place where such diversion is feasible and economical.</p> <p>4. Consider tax on diesel, new auto sales &amp; “congestion pricing” to fund transportation projects, especially mass transit.</p> <p>5. Mostly very, but not enough on mass transit like light-rail train &amp; Metrolink upgrade.</p> <p>See response number 1 and 2.</p>		

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS RTP	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
38. John Martinez Aztosal Media Center 323 N. Soto Street, #68 Los Angeles, CA 90033 323/261-4513 323/724-5528 fax	<p>1. Corrupt/insufficient MTA Rail Systems</p> <p>2. The lack of bike lanes</p> <p>3. The continued overuse of cars</p> <p>4. Overhaul the MTA &amp; seriously consider other rail/metro systems internationally (e.g. Mexico City, Europe, etc.)</p>	<p>1, 2, 3, 4, 6.</p> <p>SCAG is committed to supporting and encouraging the use of non-motorized transportation which consists primarily of bicycling, walking and jogging. This is evident in the focus on Livable Communities Strategy. An important aspect of creating sustainable, livable communities is making them both pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly. SCAG's Livable Communities Subcommittee was created to address how to quantify "livability" at a regional scale as the impacts of the strategies are realized at a neighborhood or community scale.</p> <p>SCAG'S commitment to increased use of non-motorized transportation in the region is also evident in the proposed spending in the 2001 RTP. In the Strategic Investments section, SCAG has recommended eight actions specifically designed to encourage the use of non-motorized transportation.</p> <p>5. Is the chronological order of the presentation an indicator of SCAG priorities?</p> <p>6. Force less car use</p>
39. Joseph J. Markham Transportation for Disabled-Elderly West San Gabriel Valley 20850 Napa Drive Monterey Park, CA 91755 626/286-8209		<p>1. Local lines have been cut back. There have been additions by Foothill Transit and many additions to other lines, Red Lines and Blue Lines, etc., while we in the West San Gabriel have been cut back. No MTA schedules. El Monte station closed. Buses placed on 45 mph.</p> <p>2.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	Have schedules available. Re-open El Monte Station in full operation. Give us back at least what we have had before Pete Schabarum cut it up. [For the 710 Freeway, take] off 20 minute buses and put on one hour buses.	Comment noted  1. All of these lines are either in the Baseline, Plan, or Long-Range list.  2. Comment noted.  3. Gap closures such as SR-30 and I-710 are needed to address regional travel needs. As is implied by the term itself, gap closures seek to complete gaps in the system. Doing so relieves congestion that exists on local roads and other parallel corridors.
40. Robert Meinent Southern California Transit Advocates	1. Implementing the six core rail lines in Los Angeles County: Long Beach, LAX, Norwalk, Pasadena, Whittier corridor, Santa Monica Expo & Burbank Chandler in MTA's plan.  2. The effectiveness of the bus lines and their capacity in the rail corridors is noted.  3. I don't see the need for any gap closures such as SR-30. It encourages a new door to low density development as I've seen in the San Bernardino (10) corridor.	Comment noted  1. A key strategy of SCAG's Livable Communities program is encouraging efficient growth patterns that promote alternatives to the automobile by creating a mix of homes, shops, work places, parks and civic institutions that are linked to pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly public transportation centers. The Draft 2001 RTP Update includes a number of policies that support the local governments' development of pedestrian- and transit-friendly livable communities. The plan intends to establish incentives to encourage the implementation of livable communities' strategies and transit-oriented development by local governments and subregions, private developers, and financial institutions and implement a legislative
41. John Jay Ulloth Sierra Club Transportation Committee 10609 Columbus Avenue Mission Hills, CA 91345 818/380-1252	Lack of vision to build a <u>complete</u> , 24/7, frequent system of rail and "Smart Growth" style planning to stop sprawl by requiring walking distance to that complete system.  2. Rebuild the entire Pacific Electric System (interconnect w/bus system), upon completion. See how else it can be improved/expanded to build a hub and spoke system, with rail the spokes, bus and	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE
	<p>rapid bus the hub.</p> <p>3. Need a better outreach system. So few people learn about your meetings.</p> <p>4. SCAG needs different source of funding than the cities it's supposed to lead.</p> <p>5. Need a bigger vision, longer planning period. Greens use "seventh generation planning" as a model. The needs of people seven generations from now considered equally with the needs of the present.</p>	<p>strategy to support livable communities' goals.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>4. SCAG recognizes the limitation of public funds in supporting transportation infrastructure needs. Consequently SCAG advocates public-private partnership or innovative financing efforts.</p> <p>5. The challenges of future population and employment growth and their effect on traffic congestion, transportation investment choices, air quality and housing needs are significant long-range planning issues. In response, SCAG has created the Growth Visioning Subcommittee to inform, engage and facilitate consensus on a "Vision" - a strategy for addressing the challenging consequences of anticipated growth in the region. Specifically, this Subcommittee will provide a policy framework for growth forecasts; provide direction on producing alternative urban form scenarios; consider balanced and efficient growth and transportation patterns; and consider other sustainable development and environmental issues.</p> <p>During the next two years, this Subcommittee will work with the subregions and other relevant stakeholders to develop alternative growth scenarios to accommodate projected growth. These scenarios may guide future growth forecasts in a manner that recognizes the impacts of the location of projected employment and population growth and changing demographics on land use patterns, transportation facilities, and the environment and open space. Examples of these scenarios might include promoting growth in a number of activity centers and along growth corridors, focusing growth in pedestrian-friendly, transit accessible communities, and achieving a better regional jobs-housing balance.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
42.  J.K. Drummond Southern California Transit Advocates 10415 Walker Avenue San Pedro, CA 90731-3462	<p>1. If SCAG wants to cut congestion and smog, why only a stop loss stand pat goal of maintaining same number of transit rides per capita?</p> <p>2. Why not seek to increase the number of rides per capita per year?</p>	<p>1,2. The 2001 RTP proposes a mix of transit projects geared at creating a efficient transit system. SCAG's Regional Transit Task Force will continue to work towards increasing ridership.</p>
43.  Paul A. Castillo Southern California Transit Advocates 8321 Santa Fe Springs Road Whittier, CA 90606-2720	<p>1. Having a good bus transit service! Expand and improve bus.</p> <p>2. Having a bus/rail transit service and implement new mass transit systems.</p> <p>3. I am optimistic on the Regional Transportation Plan.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. The 2001 RTP allocates approximately 60% of funding to transit. These funds will allow us to maintain and operate our bus/rail transit service as well as increase routes and service in the future.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p>
44.  John K. Flynn Supervisor County of Ventura 2900 South Saviors Road, 2 <sup>nd</sup> Floor Oxnard, CA 93033 (805) 487-6331 (805) 487- 7692 <a href="mailto:john.Flynn@mail.co.ventura.ca.us">john.Flynn@mail.co.ventura.ca.us</a>		<p>1-3. The challenges of future population and employment growth and their effect on traffic congestion, transportation investment choices, air quality and housing needs are significant long-range planning issues. In response, SCAG has created the Growth Visioning Subcommittee to inform, engage and facilitate consensus on a "Vision" - a strategy for addressing the challenging consequences of anticipated growth in the region. Specifically, this Subcommittee will provide a policy framework for growth forecasts; provide direction on producing alternative urban form scenarios; consider balanced and efficient growth and transportation patterns; and consider other sustainable development and environmental issues.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>Guilt of circular thinking, too defeatist regarding future of transit, needs more balanced approach than more highways only.</p>	<p>The efforts of this Subcommittee will not necessarily affect the growth forecast adopted for the 2001 RTP Update. Rather, during the next two years, this Subcommittee will work with the subregions and other relevant stakeholders to develop alternative growth scenarios to accommodate projected growth. These scenarios may guide future growth forecasts in a manner that recognizes the impacts of the location of projected employment and population growth and changing demographics on land use patterns, transportation facilities, and the environment and open space. Examples of these scenarios might include promoting growth in a number of activity centers and along growth corridors, focusing growth in pedestrian-friendly, transit accessible communities, and achieving a better regional jobs-housing balance.</p> <p>A key strategy of SCAG's Livable Communities program is encouraging efficient growth patterns that promote alternatives to the automobile by creating a mix of homes, shops, work places, parks and civic institutions that are linked to pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly public transportation centers. The Draft 2001 RTP Update includes a number of policies that support the local governments' development of pedestrian- and transit-friendly livable communities. The plan intends to establish incentives to encourage the implementation of livable communities' strategies and transit-oriented development by local governments and subregions, private developers, and financial institutions and implement a legislative strategy to support livable communities' goals.</p>
45.	<p>Jane Reifer 149 W. Whiting. Fullerton, CA 92632 (714) 525-3678 (714) 441-2355 <a href="mailto:cluttercontrol@earthlink.net">cluttercontrol@earthlink.net</a></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Elevating quality of transit service (especially buses) so that the majority of people will be open to using it.</li> <li>2. "Unlimited Access" to allow students to use their student passes as bus passes with local</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The 2001 RTP allocates approximately 60% of funding to transit. These funds will allow us to maintain and operate our bus/rail transit service as well as increase routes and service in the future.</li> <li>2. SCAG supports the idea that fare structures should be coordinated when possible to create a seamless regional transit network.</li> </ol>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE
	agencies.	<p>Furthermore, SCAG suggests that on corridors or arterials that are used by multiple operators, operators should consider coordinated ticketing to enable “open door” policies.</p> <p>3. The driving force behind the Regional Transit Task Force is to create seamless transit across the Southern California region. The task force works towards identifying problems and solutions to achieve a better regional transit network.</p> <p>4. SCAG’s cost-effectiveness analysis in the 2001 RTP considers the external costs (such as the health effects of air pollution) from all modes of travel, including motor vehicles.</p> <p>5. Comment noted</p>
3. Assess transit regionally to eliminate gaps in country burden areas.	4. Skews funding away from transit by slowing external costs for transit project, but not for freeway/car projects which unfairly show outrage high ROI, on car projects.	<p>1. SCAG agrees that transit must be available when the customer wants to use it and accessible by customers without major obstacles (physical, institutional, or informational).</p> <p>The 2001 RTP proposes many projects that will increase access to public transportation while helping to reduce pollution. For example, five new light rail lines will be operating by 2010.</p>
46. Mavie Guerra El Concilio 400 S B. St Tustin, CA. 92780 (805) 486-9777 (805) 486-9881 <a href="mailto:mavieg@Ad">mavieg@Ad</a>		<p>1. Public transportation that would help with keeping pollution down. We need easy access. Word of mouth was the way they heard about the meeting.</p>
47. Don Kornreich 657 P Avenue Sevilla Laguna Woods, CA 92453 949/206-0545 <a href="mailto:dwkbk@fea.net">dwkbk@fea.net</a>		<p>1. SCAG should look at some of the PRT (Personal Rapid Transit) mass transit systems as either a supplement to Maglev (increase Maglev ridership) or (if Maglev is not implemented here) a possible replacement of Maglev.</p> <p>1. PRT Technology is the latest evolution of “people mover” system. Perhaps the best known example of PRT technology was the PRT 2000 system developed by the University of Minnesota and marketed by the Raytheon Corporation in the early and mid-1990s. There were two serious studies of the PRT 2000 in the SCAG</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>Region. The first was in the early 1990s for the City of Palm Desert. The second was the City of Irvine Circulator study in the mid-1990s. Both studies undertook a serious evaluation of the proposed application of the PRT 2000 system. In both of these studies SCAG participated in the planning evaluations.</p> <p>Regional studies have repeatedly demonstrated that there are substantially greater economics of scale in moving larger numbers of people in fewer high-capacity vehicles (for long distance trips) than moving people in a large number of vehicles with small carrying capacity. The inverse is also true.</p> <p>In collector/distributor/circulator configurations (multi-modal station sites, CBDs, etc.) studies demonstrated that the more traditional transit applications (smart shuttles, small bus, trolley bus, taxi/van) were more cost effective than people mover systems. In addition the proposed systems funding depended upon a large percentage of federal capital investment. It is questionable that a PRT system could have been evaluated as a preferred modal alternative in a full MIS.</p> <p>2,3. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Our problems by 2010 and beyond with air quality (particularly ozone and PM10), air traffic (crowded airports and air space), and ground access (recent annual traffic growth rates on our freeways of 1.8%) require an approach that does not continue to emphasize more traffic lanes including HOV/HOT, improved intersections, and more highways/freeways/toll roads.</p> <p>3. The recent annual growth rates of regional traffic can continue. We must turn to an elevated mass transit system as a cost-</p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
48.	<p>Ed Jones SCAG Liaison 4534 Cherry Valley Circle Westlake Village 805/494-0891 805/373-9099 Fax <a href="mailto:ejassoc@pacbell.net">ejassoc@pacbell.net</a></p> <p>effective method for improving our ground access capability and air quality.</p>	<p>1. Improvement of traffic flow on 101 Freeway from Ventura County to Los Angeles basin. Closer full service airport.</p> <p>2. Improve traffic on 101 Freeway either by widening freeway, or adding some form of rapid transit.</p> <p>3. Good approach; needs more work.</p> <p>1. Improvement of I-101 would improve access to LAX and Burbank airports for Ventura County air travelers under all scenarios. However, both airports are capacity constrained, and improved access to Palmdale Airport for impacted travelers would also be needed.</p> <p>2. The US-101 freeway is identified as a long-range corridor in the RTP, and it is the subject of a Major Investment Study that will soon be under way.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p>
49.	<p>Shawn Miyake Keiro Services 325 So. Boyle Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90033 323/980-7501</p>	<p>1. Congestion on freeways and vehicle transit for low income persons. Please consider impact on older adults as transportation is 10 on most needs surveys.</p> <p>2. Improve access services. Not a reliable system today.</p> <p>3. My exposure to the complex issues related</p> <p>1. SCAG's environmental justice analysis for the 2001 RTP considered region-wide impacts as low-income and elderly populations.</p> <p>2. SCAG would support the creation of quality control measures to assure that transit providers are meeting the needs of their passengers. Furthermore, in the next fiscal year a study of jitney/shuttle services will be conducted. Jitney/shuttle services are on demand personal transit services that could create more options for those who need paratransit services.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
50.	<p>Rigo Saborio AARP 3460 Wilshire Blvd., Ste. 300 Los Angeles, CA 90010 213/380-1800 Fax <a href="mailto:rsaborio@aarp.org">rsaborio@aarp.org</a></p>	<p>1. Please refer to the reply given to comment #1.</p> <p>What is the projected impact your plan will have on those 65+. In particularly, how it relates to allowing our seniors to age in place at home. Will transportation be accessible; will the lines enable them to get to healthcare services, religious institutions, food, and entertainment?</p> <p>2. How about safety?</p> <p>The 2001 RTP includes a safety performance indicator.</p>
51.	<p>Messele Negash W.L.C.A.C. 10950 S. Central Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90059 323/357-3533 323-563-7307 <a href="mailto:mnegash@wlcac.org">mnegash@wlcac.org</a></p>	<p>1. Transportation to and from work; to and from shopping, medical facilities and recreation. Especially in the low-income communities.</p> <p>2. Expand transit services such as smart shuttle</p> <p>This is in the 2001 Plan.</p>
52.	<p>Michael Kodama The Ethnic Coalition of Southern California P. O. Box 10193 Burbank, CA 91510-0193 818/846-6272 <a href="mailto:mkodama@aol.com">mkodama@aol.com</a></p>	<p>1,3. SCAG is committed to implementing its environmental justice policy and procedure throughout the regional transportation planning process.</p> <p>2. A key strategy of SCAG's Livable Communities program is</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>and support transit options and access for communities.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Support collaborate planning process advocated by plan and SCAG; continue effort on environmental justice throughout.</p>	<p>encouraging efficient growth patterns that promote alternatives to the automobile by creating a mix of homes, shops, work places, parks and civic institutions that are linked to pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly public transportation centers. The Draft 2001 RTP Update includes a number of policies that support the local governments' development of pedestrian- and transit-friendly livable communities. The plan intends to establish incentives to encourage the implementation of livable communities' strategies and transit-oriented development by local governments and subregions, private developers, and financial institutions and implement a legislative strategy to support livable communities' goals.</p>
53.  Amber Gigo Alameda Corridor Jobs Coalition 2905 S. Vermont Avenue, Ste. 201 Los Angeles, CA 323/373-1091 <a href="mailto:amberj@acjc-tec.org">amberj@acjc-tec.org</a>	<p>1.</p> <p>Low-income communities having access to light rail systems that connect them with employment opportunities, i.e. commuter rail.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Commuter Rail, shuttle service, community involvement, low-cost cars/ownership, funding and some transportation issues.</p>	<p>1, 2.</p> <p>There are plans to expand current light rail to the East and West. The East side has a very dense population of low-income residents. Service on the commuter rail system will be increasing in the future. The San Jacinto commuter rail corridor will be an extension of the system and allow more access to employment centers.</p>
54.  Rusty Kennedy OC Human Relations Commission 1300 S. Grand Santa Ana, CA 92705 714/567-7465 714/567-7474 (fax) <a href="mailto:rusty@ochumanrelations.org">rusty@ochumanrelations.org</a>	<p>1.</p> <p>Affordability and accessibility of buses for very low wage earners.</p>	<p>1,3.</p> <p>SCAG supports the coordination of fare structures and/or the coordination of ticketing by multiple operators in order to create a seamless regional transit network. SCAG has recommended the implementation of differential transit fare (e.g. one-half fare off-peak). SCAG also supports employer-based incentives for encouraging employees to use public transit. Finally, SCAG supports the implementation of user-side subsidies where service-side is too expensive or impractical. Instituting these changes would help to create more affordable transit.</p> <p>SCAG believes that transit must be available when the customer wants to use it and accessible by customers without major obstacles</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>2. Focus on clean buses. Establish light rail for future i.e. increasingly attractive alternative to traffic.</p> <p>3. Keep focus on serving the very low and low income wage earner, they are best customers.</p> <p>4. Establish trolley, light rail as way of expanding into mid-class for work as first priority.</p>	<p>2. The region is committed through the State Implementation Program to achieving a bus fleet with a minimum of 70% clean fuel buses by 2010. The 2001 RTP proposes five new light rail lines that will be operable by 2010.</p> <p>4. The new proposed Pasadena Light Rail and Westside Exposition will travel through some middle class neighborhoods and will provide a good alternative for those who use the 10 and 110 freeways.</p>
55. El Segundo Rotary Club	<p>1. What about reversible lanes in the peak hours as is done in Seattle.</p> <p>2. There is some trepidation re: high speed rail.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. The initial feasibility study funded as part of the FRA competition has demonstrated that the deployment of an Intra-regional Maglev system does offer a practical high-speed/high-capacity surface transportation alternative to connect regional activity centers and multi-modal transportation facilities.</p>
56. Ann Staff Engineer CVAG	<p>1. Maps only reflects Palm Springs and does not reflect whole Coachella Valley.</p> <p>2. Only a partial list of projects for CVAG are listed.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. Due to the dimensions of the SCAG region, it is difficult to show the entire region and still provide meaningful information on the maps.</p> <p>2. SCAG has worked with various task forces and committees and has solicited the County Transportation Commissions and sub-regions to</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
57. VCOG Community Dialogue Workshop November 15, 2000	<p>1. Truck Lanes – prohibit trucks during peak hours on the freeways.</p> <p>2. Congestion on freeways 5, 23, 118</p>	<p>provide input into the plan. The projects listed are a result of this input.</p> <p>1. The Goods Movement Advisory Committee has recommended potential solutions including adjusting hours in freight and intermodal areas and at commercial and industrial loading docks to permit trucks to load before, between, and after peak hours of the day.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. The RTP identifies several improvements on the I-5, SR-23, and SR-118 freeways in the baseline and plan.</p> <p>3, 4. The RTP includes the completion of the toll roads in Orange County in the baseline. Toll roads provide a way to pay for much-needed transportation projects in a time of limited financial resources. Tolls or other user fees are often suggested as a means to encourage drivers to carpool or shift their travel behavior in order to reduce congestion. The Long Range Finance Task Force has discussed the use of tolls. Please refer to the Technical Appendix F: Finance for a summary of this discussion.</p> <p>3. Toll Roads – higher fee for vehicles with fewer passengers to encourage carpooling.</p> <p>4. Toll Roads – Set up toll roads during rush hours.</p>
58. Torres Martinez Reservation Empowerment Zone Meeting April 15, 2000		

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	(Calexico – 10)	<p>programmed to provide the linkage between the international border and I-10 for trucks, including SR-7 north to I-8, SR-111 from I-8 northward, connecting with SR-86 above the Salton Sea. A Brawley bypass along the parallel section of SR-86 has also been included in the plan.</p> <p>The RTP includes plans for truck lanes on SR-60 and I-15, and truck lane feasibility studies for I-710 and I-5. The Plan also includes truck climbing lanes on SR-57 and I-15, and in addition truck climbing lanes are already programmed in the RTIP for I-215, I-10, and another segment of I-15.</p> <p>Please refer to the Good Movement section of the 2001 RTP.</p> <p>5. Who is in charge? RCTC – RTP. Smaller goes into larger</p> <p>6. Truck Lanes plans?</p> <p>7. How does Caltrans and County studies coordinate? How do studies work together?</p> <p>8. How are funds and responsibilities merge?</p> <p>9. How about input from Tribe?</p> <p>10. Wants expanded presentation from SCAG.</p> <p>59. San Gabriel Valley Council of Governments Transportation Committee</p> <p>1. The Committee needs to decide if it wants to comment on the RTP as individuals or as</p> <p>1. Comment noted.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>2. What kind of changes are being proposed for Regional Transit from 1998?</p> <p>3. How do you define "efficiency"?</p> <p>4. What about other modeling techniques? Is there a way we can investigate better cost savings? (input/output)</p> <p>5. I like Maglev, but what effect does it have on the daily commute problem? This needs an independent review.</p> <p>6. The modeling process is very complicated. We need to provide inputs to it now (or consider doing our own) so that we can reflect accurate local conditions.</p> <p>7. The list of projects between the RTP and LRTP need to be more consistent.</p> <p>8. Would like for SCAG's air quality staff to attend our next meeting to discuss the</p>	<p>2. The largest difference is in the transit corridors. There are many new lines proposed in the 2001 RTP.</p> <p>3,4. Efficiency refers to the optimization of an output given a certain amount of input. For the level of transportation investments proposed in the RTP, we seek to optimize our return in terms of improvements in mobility, air quality, and so on. We also seek to optimize the lifespan of the transportation system by investing in operations and maintenance.</p> <p>5. When fully deployed the Maglev system will have the design capacity of 500-600 hundred thousand ADT (average daily trips). The preliminary ridership estimation for the LAX-March Inland Port Corridor is approximately 120,000 ADT. This system is designed (and intended) as a surface transportation alternative for longer distance commuter trips. The congestion relief and air quality benefits would be significant.</p> <p>6. The 2001 RTP includes local input provided by CTCs. The RTP Baseline includes TIP projects, Governor's Plan (TCRP), and TEA-21 priority projects that are submitted from local CTCs to SCAG. All the above inputs are incorporated into the modeling process.</p> <p>7. SCAG staff has worked closely with LACMTA staff in an attempt to achieve consistency between the RTP and the LRTP.</p> <p>8. Comment noted.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
60. Citywide Task Force on Pedestrian Safety Orange County, C/o Spinner Lamar & Associates Strategic Counsel in Public Affairs 275 Centennial Way, Suite 201 Tustin, CA 92780 714/790-7147 714/790-1716 (fax) <a href="mailto:spinlamar@earthlink.net">spinlamar@earthlink.net</a>	<p>9. Would like to further discuss Maglev. Can't Maglev be used as an "enabler" in the model to reduce traffic congestion?</p> <p>9. See response 5.</p> <p>1-3. SCAG is committed to supporting and encouraging the use of non-motorized transportation which consists primarily of bicycling, walking and jogging. This is evident in the focus on Livable Communities Strategy. An important aspect of creating sustainable, livable communities is making them both pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly. SCAG's Livable Communities Subcommittee was created to address how to quantify "livability" at a regional scale as the impacts of the strategies are realized at a neighborhood or community scale.</p> <p>SCAG'S commitment to increased use of non-motorized transportation in the region is also evident in the proposed spending in the 2001 RTP. In the Strategic Investments section, SCAG has recommended eight actions specifically designed to encourage the use of non-motorized transportation.</p> <p>4. 70 percent of the population is growing and have differing transportation needs. How will the RTP address this and what plans are being made to accommodate seniors?</p> <p>The Southern California Association of Governments is concerned with the transit needs of all people including the specific needs of seniors. Our region will see a rise in the elderly (65 and older) population to 15.3% in 2025, from 9.9% in 1997. In updating the Regional Transportation Plan for Southern California SCAG has a number of goals guiding its proposed plan that will help to better serve this segment of the population. There are two goals pertaining</p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>to improving services for users of transit. First is the general goal of improving transportation and mobility for all people. A second goal is to meet the public's transportation needs in safe, reliable, and economical ways, which will meet the needs of those who depend on public transit such as the elderly.</p>
61. Arroyo Verdugo Cities Transportation Subcommittee LaCanada City Hall November 15, 2000	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will wait to receive draft RTP and to further discuss RTP recommendations.</li> <li>2. Issues on proposed Maglev alignment on the 210 and 710 freeways gap closure.</li> <li>3. What are the fiscal impacts of the transition from gasoline to alternative fuels as well as the connectivity of airports, specifically Burbank?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Comment noted.</li> <li>2. The I-210 and the I-710 alignment options that were developed as part of the early analysis have been dropped from consideration.</li> <li>3. SCAG anticipates that increased consumption of alternative fuels would greatly reduce revenues available for transportation. The reduction in state and federal gas tax revenues for the region throughout the time horizon of the 2001 RTP could be as much as \$10 to \$11 billion.</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The website is at <a href="http://www.scag.ca.gov">www.scag.ca.gov</a>.</li> <li>2. Comment noted.</li> <li>3. Comment noted. The outreach program contains an active media component.</li> </ol>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>4. Would like to receive information on MTA Long Range Plan projects in the RTP.</p> <p>5. Interested in 710 gap closure and recommend outreach workshop on that issue in that area.</p>	<p>4. The 2001 RTP can be viewed at SCAG's website (see #1).</p> <p>5. Comment noted.</p>
63. Ventura Council of Governments Board Meeting Oxnard City Hall (Council Chamber) 305 West Third Street December 7, 2000	<p>1. Has anyone from the private sector expressed interest in participating in Maglev's development?</p> <p>2. How affordable will Maglev fare be to the general public?</p>	<p>1. As of 2/28/01 over two hundred private firms had expressed an interest in participation in Maglev development.</p> <p>2. At the direction of SCAG's Regional Council the fare structure for the Maglev system assumes no O&amp;M subsidy from the public sector. The initial feasibility study indicates that the fully allocated cost would cost between \$.20-.23 cents per passenger mile. A fifty-mile trip could cost between \$10-12 dollars.</p> <p>Traditional transit systems, both bus and rail modes, currently are subsidized in an amount between 50 to 100 percent of the actual trip cost. Subsidy levels as a whole or for specific rider categories are policy/political decisions.</p> <p>3. What are the connections to Maglev, Metrolink and buses?</p>
64. SCAG Environmental Justice Community Leadership	<p>1. A discussion of environmental justice issues and concerns was conducted.</p>	<p>1. SCAG staff was present at the meeting – responses provided by: Ikhrafa, Macias, Bates and, Pfeffer.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
65.  Pat Krane Human Relations 1300 S. Grand #B Santa Ana, CA 949/644-6669 949/644-5421 (fax)	January 5, 2001  1. Airport availability i.e. El Toro Airport	<p>1. A new airport at El Toro is considered in all scenarios of the RTP except one (Scenario 9). Please see the 2001 RTP, Section V, Strategic Investments, for a listing of policies, scenarios and guiding principles. However, SCAG has no ultimate authority over the funding and construction of new airports, nor does SCAG have authority over decisions by airlines to invest in service at new airports.</p> <p>2. Tighten truck emission standards</p> <p>3. How does OCTA work with SCAG on RTP, if at all?</p>
66.  Regina B. Front H.R.C. 6801 Via Angelina Huntington Beach, CA 92647 714/848-1197 <a href="mailto:Reginabf@msn.com">Reginabf@msn.com</a>		<p>1. There will come a time when I can't drive or I am 73 years old – at this time, I have driven 166,000 miles since 1989.</p> <p>2. Promote multiple ways to transport people as soon as possible.</p> <p>3. They need to do more research so they have</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
67. David Roberts Office of Mark Ridley-Thomas City of Los Angeles L.A. City Hall 200 N. Main Street, Room 501 Los Angeles, CA 90012 213/485-3331 123/485-7683 (fax) <a href="mailto:draborts@ci.la.ca.us">draborts@ci.la.ca.us</a>	more options with costs, time schedules and ways to financing this project.	<p>1,2. Comments noted. Transportation projects by nature are geographic and may affect multiple communities—often with different viewpoints—at the same time. At the same time, the RTP maintains a regional perspective on transportation and strives for improvements to the region as a whole.</p> <p>1. Great planning but lack of vision/desire needed to implement.</p> <p>2. Package holistic solutions that benefit many communities (vocation/ethnicity, age, income); don't pit one community vs. another community.</p> <p>1. What is the completion date of the Alameda Corridor?</p> <p>2. Is the Alameda Corridor an MTA project?</p> <p>3. The Alameda Corridor goes through Huntington Park and therefore should employ Huntington Park residents.</p> <p>4. The RTP has too much information for the East LA community</p> <p>5. Please clarify the gas tax proposals.</p> <p>1. The Alameda Corridor will be completed in 2002.</p> <p>2. It is a joint project by the Ports of Long Beach and Los Angeles, the cities along the corridor, and the MTA.</p> <p>3 ACTA has a program to hire local and minority people for Alameda Corridor construction.</p> <p>4. Comment noted.</p> <p>5. The gas tax proposal entails an adjustment of the state motor vehicle fuel excise tax (on all fuels) in line with historical adjustments. Please refer to the finance section of the final 2001 RTP for further</p>
		M-266

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>6. What are the specific congestion relief plans for 3<sup>rd</sup> street?</p> <p>7.</p> <p>We do not want any rail running through East L. A. Additional funding should be put toward buses to improve service and frequency.</p> <p>8.</p> <p>We do not want parking to be removed when the rail line come to East Los Angeles.</p>	<p>clarification.</p> <p>6. The RTP does not specify traffic improvement programs for individual local streets. Local traffic improvements are under the authority of individual governments.</p> <p>7, 8.</p> <p>There is a planned expansion of light rail into the East L.A. The construction of the Light Rail will not decrease the amount of bus service in the area. In fact bus service in this area will increase, as there will be a need for bus service to and from the station.</p> <p>1.</p> <p>The creation of measures that will increase ridership of public transit is one of the highest priorities for SCAG. SCAG's transit development philosophy focuses on services that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Š available for use when customers want them</li> <li>Š accessible by customers without major obstacles (physical, institutional, or informational)</li> <li>Š planned from the customer's point of view.</li> </ul> <p>2.</p> <p>All transportation agencies get together and work things out rather than everyone doing their own thing. Example, put all funding into one project at a time to accomplish something.</p> <p>3.</p>
69.	<p>Gina Horn Delta Airlines P. O. Box 90676</p> <p>310/646-1271 310/646-0299 (fax) <a href="mailto:gini.horn@delta-air.com">gini.horn@delta-air.com</a></p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>3. Like putting Greenline all the way into airport, add more buses to airport, airport to airport service affordable. Thanks for the information. It is appreciated.</p>	<p>There are now plans to extend the Green Line into LAX and long-range plans to extend it south into the South Bay.</p> <p>1, 2, 4. SCAG recognizes the difficulties associated with actually implementing taxes on alternative fuel vehicles. SCAG is simply advocating the need for further study and assessment of alternative fuel vehicles in the market and in turn, impacts on transportation revenues.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>4. How to assess the amount of tax to be paid on vehicles using alternative fuels?</p> <p>5.</p> <p>How does the RTP address the issues of accessibility for those who simply want to take public transit?</p> <p>6. How does the RTP address transit connection gaps, e.g., Greenline Aviation Station to North Sepulveda?</p> <p>7. As an employee transportation coordinator, I often find it hard to make transportation</p> <p>5, 6, 7. There are a number of measures suggested by SCAG that will enhance both the accessibility and quality of transit services. First, SCAG's transit development philosophy focuses on services that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>↳ available for use when customers want them</li> <li>↳ accessible by customers without major obstacles (physical, institutional, or informational)</li> <li>↳ planned from the customer's point of view.</li> </ul> <p>Additionally, SCAG has recommended a number of measures to encourage the use of public transit like service quality improvements, employer-based incentives, differential transit fare (e.g. charging one-half fare during off-peak operating hours), and the</p>
70. Westchester/LAX Transportation Management Association 201 N. Douglas El Segundo, CA	<p>1. Is SCAG familiar with the taxing strategies for alternative fuels?</p> <p>2. Is imposing tax on alternative fuels reasonable?</p> <p>3. How is the current energy crisis affect the future of electronic vehicles?</p> <p>4. How to assess the amount of tax to be paid on vehicles using alternative fuels?</p> <p>5.</p> <p>How does the RTP address the issues of accessibility for those who simply want to take public transit?</p> <p>6. How does the RTP address transit connection gaps, e.g., Greenline Aviation Station to North Sepulveda?</p> <p>7. As an employee transportation coordinator, I often find it hard to make transportation</p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>arrangements for Welfare to Work employees who reside in low-and moderate-income communities.</p> <p>8. Does the RTP include public transit plans to connect these communities to where the jobs are, e.g., El Segundo?</p> <p>9. Did SCAG take into consideration the LAX Master Plan in it's aviation analysis?</p>	<p>aggressive marketing of services. An implementation plan will be developed for these recommendations in the future. The RTP includes plans to close many service gaps. For example, there is a planned extension of the Green Line to LAX.</p> <p>8. The extension of the Green Line will create greater access to employment centers in the area of El Segundo.</p> <p>9. LAX Master Plan Improvements were considered in several scenarios. Aviation Scenario 9, which included the LAX Master Plan, was one of the scenarios chosen for extended evaluation. Please see RTP Section V. Strategic Investments, Pages 87-91 for a listing of policies, scenarios and guiding principles.</p>
71. Community Dialogue Jackie Robinson Center 1020 N. Fair Oaks Avenue Pasadena, CA	<p>1. Has there been a study that evaluates the success or effectiveness of the existing toll roads?</p> <p>2. How does SCAG address the disproportionate burdens proposed tax strategies placed on the poor comparing to the rich?</p>	<p>1. No such study has been conducted yet. Tollroads are still relatively new in the region.</p> <p>2. The tax strategies proposed in the plan involve increases in sales and gasoline taxes, both of which are regressive – that is, they consume a larger percentage of income for low-income than for high-income people. However, our analysis shows that low-income groups will receive a fair share of several plan benefits. For example, the lowest 40% of households (in terms of annual income) pay only 22% of total gasoline and sales taxes collected in the region, and will receive a similar share of the total time savings for auto travel under the plan. When transit travel is considered, this 40% of households will enjoy almost 60% of the total time savings. Using another measure of plan benefits, people who are limited by their income to low-cost forms of transit, such as local buses, will receive a 11-26% improvement in accessibility to jobs as a result of the plan, compared with only a 8% improvement for the region as a whole.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>3.</p> <p>How is SCAG making the draft RTP more accessible? Are copies of the draft RTP available in the libraries?</p>	<p>3.</p> <p>Copies of the Draft 2001 RTP Update were sent to over 45 libraries located throughout the six county SCAG region (i.e., Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, San Bernardino, and Imperial Counties). Additionally, the document is also available within SCAG's on-site library and on the agency's web page (<a href="http://www.scag.ca.gov">www.scag.ca.gov</a>)</p>
<p>72.</p> <p>Diana Stoney South Pasadena Transportation Commission 1116 Avon Place South Pasadena, CA 91030-3404 626/799-2876</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>Complete livable cities with open space to foster a peaceful society; instead of demonstrating the 1950's study that mice and men become aggressive violent creatures when forced to live in overcrowded cities.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Zero population growth; of course this is unacceptable to those involved in political greed. Zero population growth could make 90% of mankind's problems manageable but would require government to solve problems instead of study and project.</p>	<p>1, 2, 3, 4.</p> <p>SCAG is committed to supporting and encouraging the use of non-motorized transportation which consists primarily of bicycling, walking and jogging. This is evident in the focus on Livable Communities Strategy. An important aspect of creating sustainable, livable communities is making them both pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly. SCAG's Livable Communities Subcommittee was created to address how to quantify "livability" at a regional scale as the impacts of the strategies are realized at a neighborhood or community scale.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>RTP is inconsistent, concerned about air quality while attacking alternative fuel through taxation. Concerned about environmental injustice while seeking more vehicular and truck capacity through minority areas etc....etc.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>We need all levels of fixed rail (heavy, light, mono and guideway) augmented at the terminals/stations by smaller, friendlier</p> <p>Comment noted, the Final RTP includes many more bus routes than the Draft RTP.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>73. South Pasadena Transportation Commission 1414 Mission Street South Pasadena, CA</p> <p>buses which also carry bicycles. Shared cars at the stations is another possibility, i.e., I leave my car at Oxnard metrolink station and ride to Burbank, meanwhile you ride metrolink to Oxnard and use my car to go to work.</p> <p>1. The RTP includes the 710 gap closure for completion in two segments one to be completed by 2010 and one by 2020.</p> <p>2. SCAG updates the RTP every three years, if goals appear unreachable they would be discussed and revised through the public debate process during the next RTP cycle.</p> <p>3, 5. The RTP PEIR is a programmatic document that analyzes potential impacts on a regional-level. It does not provide project-by-project impact analysis. This level of analysis is not possible given that specific design features, route alignment, etc., are not known at this time. All projects listed in the Final RTP were programmatically reviewed, their locations were generally reviewed to identify potential impacts. The I-710 gap closure is mentioned within the document in a number of locations (i.e., population, employment, and housing, land use, noise, views and aesthetics, etc.). The analysis provided in the document relative to the I-710 is general in nature and does not identify project specific analysis.</p> <p>Relative to conformity, the I-710 gap closure is one of many regionally significant transportation projects designed to reduce emissions and ensure that conformity under the Clean Air Act is met</p>		

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>4. Why are the MTA projects listed in its long-range plan absent from the projects listed in the RTP and how will SCAG reconcile the missing projects?</p> <p>5. How can you have a valid EIR when you do not know what the final projects and impacts are going to be in the RTP if all the projects are not currently listed on the RTP projects list?</p> <p>6. Why does the recommended funding strategy contradict the state's position of reducing taxes?</p> <p>7. Why is there a recommendation for adding an excise tax on alternative fuels, which would discourage its use, when alternative fuels is the direction that needs to be taken to meet air quality standards, is this not a self-defeating strategy, doesn't this contradict the push for use of clean air vehicles?</p> <p>8. What models were used to establish the clean air standards, if the models considered and used were proven to be invalid, would you use the models anyway in the RTP, and</p>	<p>for the region. Inclusion of the I-710 in the 2001 RTP update is important in achieving this goal.</p> <p>4. The differences between SCAG's RTP and the MTA's LRTP are a result of having separate schedules. SCAG has worked, and will continue working, with MTA to ensure the two transportation plans are consistent.</p> <p>5. See response number 3.</p> <p>6, 7. SCAG recognizes the need for additional transportation funds in order to accommodate the region's growing populations. Moreover, the potential heavy market penetration of alternative fuel vehicles would further reduce limited public funds for transportation, requiring a reassessment of providing tax incentives. As alternative fuel vehicles become more prevalent on the roads, costs for road repair should be proportional to use. SCAG is pursuing state budget augmentation for further study of such an option.</p> <p>8. DTIM2/EMFAC7g is the emission model used in the 1999 Ozone SIP in establishing on-road mobile source emission budget for the South Coast Air Basin. Federal law requires consistency between the model used in the SIP to establish the emission budget and the model</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	if an invalid model contributed to a problem in the RTP, does that not create a bigger problem?	used for conformity analysis in the RTP. DTIM2 was developed by Caltrans and EMFAC7g was developed by CARB.  In the event the model is proven to be invalid, the SIP in which the model is used will need to be amended. Consequently, the RTP will also need to be revised for the conformity analysis portion.
74. Mary Lou Tryba SPA – 8 616 E. Carson Street, #D-29 Carson, CA 90745	<p>1. Dollar Cost.</p> <p>2. Dollar cost in the future for roads, freeway, Alameda Corridor, upkeep, etc. How MTA or other city transportation can be more forthcoming to be more progressive in the future.</p> <p>3. The RTP needs to be brought down to regular other grassroot club meeting all over states, county, city avenues! Work on that calendar idea for all of us in the LA and Orange County Basin.</p>	<p>1, 2. The Alameda corridor is paid for through grants, port funds, and bonds paid for by user charges on railcars and containers carried over the corridor. Alameda Corridor funding has been secured.</p> <p>3. An extensive outreach program was undertaken for the RTP to ensure that community stockholders were provided with an opportunity to comment on the RTP. A total of 122 meetings were held throughout the region.</p>
75. Catherine Rips Sunline Transit Agency 32505 Harry Oliver Trail 760/343-3456 760/341-0345 – fax copybyrips@netpipeline.net		<p>1. Making sure those who need public transit are aware of service and have access.</p> <p>2. Higher funding for public transit, more frequency would increase ridership. Eliminate need for complex schedules statewide or regionwide:</p> <p>education/outreach about health impact of mobile source pollution.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
76. Joan Hoesterey City of La Palms 7822 Walker Street La Palma, CA 90623 714/690-3334 714/523-2141 <a href="mailto:jmhoes@pacbell.net">jmhoes@pacbell.net</a>	<p>3. Interesting to hear projections and consider the regional picture instead of just thinking locally.</p> <p>1. Maintenance of existing streets and highways, more demand signals and widening roads and highways where possible. Airports for Orange County. We need El Toro, smart streets.</p> <p>2. El Toro, truck lanes on heavy truck routes, longer merge lanes at interchanges, bring greenline into LAX, provide rail into John Wayne and El Toro plans.</p> <p>3. We need to do a better job of creating clear condensed points to get out to the public, business and local government communities.</p> <p>4. Transit – Southern California has not yet achieved any movement of people from cars to transit. We do not live or work in patterns that are conducive to daily work transit. However, a great deal of relief can be achieved if focus is directed to utilizing light rail into airports and large employment centers from parking lots in less congested areas.</p>	<p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>1, 2. Comments noted. The RTP includes a Green Line extension to LAX, and funding for operations and maintenance of existing roads. Development of El Toro is considered in several aviation scenarios. Please see RTP Section V. Strategic Investments, Pages 87-91 for a listing of policies, scenarios and guiding principles. The RTP includes plans for truck lanes on SR-50 and I-15, and truck lane feasibility studies for I-710 and I-5. The Plan also includes truck climbing lanes on SR-57 and I-15, and in addition truck climbing lanes are already programmed in the RTIP for I-215, I-10, and another segment of I-15.</p> <p>3. SCAG has undertaken an extensive public outreach effort including 122 community meetings.</p> <p>4. Historically, Southern Californians have not lived or worked in patterns that are conducive to utilizing transit for transportation to work. In the mean time, the creation of measures that will increase ridership of public transit is one of the highest priorities for SCAG. This is why SCAG's transit development philosophy focuses on services that are:      "available for use when customers want them-accessible by customers without major obstacles (physical, institutional, or informational)-planned from the customers point of view"</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>Transit is not always as convenient as door-to-door service provided by a private automobile. However, SCAG has made a number of suggestions for change that would enhance the quality of service currently provided to passengers. A number of the changes suggested by SCAG are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># Better schedule adherence. Buses should arrive within five minutes of the published time. Where this is not practical, realistic schedules should be published.</li> <li># Bus stops should be physically adequate to accommodate passenger access and egress, as well as minimize auto/bus conflicts (even if this means the removal of parking) and should be free of pedestrian impediments.</li> <li># Regional transit vehicles should be equipped with Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technology where this adds to on-time reliability and/or operating efficiencies.</li> <li># Bus priority service (transitway or rapid bus) should be implemented concurrently with smart street technology.</li> <li># On corridors or arterials that are used by multiple operators, operators, should consider coordinated ticketing to enable “open door” policies.</li> <li># Fare structures should be coordinated when possible to create a seamless regional transit network.</li> </ul>	<p>SCAG proposed a number of other actions be taken to encourage the use of public transit like employer-based incentives, differential transit fare (e.g. charging one-half fare during off-peak operating hours), and the aggressive marketing of services.</p> <p>In the RTP there are plans for the expansion of light rail into employment centers and airports. Additionally, SCAG has proposed a high-speed rail system that would take passengers to both employment centers and airports.</p> <p>1. The Plan endorses completion of the Alameda Corridor which will be fully grade separated and includes improved safety and reliability</p>
77.	Pat King Field Representative Office of Senator Neil Soto	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS RTP	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
832 N. Euclid Ontario, CA 91762 909/984-7741 909/984-6695 – fax	<p>2.</p> <p>Support extending fuel sales tax and dedicating all revenues generated to transportation by formula, not pork barrel.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Great, need money on RTP</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>SCAG is sponsoring state legislation and resolutions to further pursue studies and efforts to garner additional transportation revenues.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>The RTP recognizes the importance of arterials as well as highways. Collectively, the arterials in the entire region account for over 65 percent of the total road network and carry over 50 percent of total vehicular traffic. However, any one freeway corridor of regional significance may carry many times more automobiles during a typical morning rush hour than any one arterial. The RTP proposes investments in highways that address regional travel patterns in an effort to reduce congestion and improve air quality.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>To what extent has SCAG looked at intermodal transportation? Goods movement and in general?</p> <p>3.</p> <p>If LAX is going to expand and meet air</p> <p>3.</p> <p>SCAG has taken each scenario being considered, including the RTP</p>
78.  South Bay Associations of Chamber of Commerce – Economic Development Committee  Thursday, January 25, 2001	<p>1.</p> <p>What are the trade offs between highways and arterials in terms of funding and how cars are using each?</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>There is already on-dock, intermodal rail loading of marine containers at the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, and near-dock container loading at the ICTF in Carson. There are plans for expanded on-dock loading at the ports. The RTP includes a study of inland port/inland domestic intermodal terminals. It also includes major programs to study and construct truck lanes and railroad grade crossings improvements along freight railroads, to implement the Southwest Passage goods movement corridor, conduct an empty container reduction study, and do a rail freight main line productivity study.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>traffic demand, are we going to plan for more cars on the freeways, arterials,, etc.? </p> <p>4. We're more interested in economic development of the South Bay.</p> <p>5. What level of planning does SCAG go through and how is economic development involved and how can we address our local issues?</p>	<p>Medium scenario (which has an unconstrained LAX handling over 100 million passengers) and evaluated them in the 2001 RTP PEIR, which programmatically looks at the traffic impacts of each scenario. For a detailed description of the traffic impacts of the various aviation scenarios, please see the RTP DEIR Volume 1, Section 3.3 on Transportation (page TC-43 through page TC-69).</p> <p>4. Comment noted.</p> <p>5. The RTP is a regional plan that addresses region-wide concerns such as air quality and mobility. However, SCAG is working towards involving the private sector to a larger extent than it has done before, so that the RTP can also reflect businesses' concerns about transportation and economic development. Local issues of development, however, remain under the authority of individual city governments.</p> <p>6. How much of the planning process is SCAG's planning and how much is other organizations?</p>
79. H.B. Smith 3ESD	<p>851 S. Mt. Vernon Colton, CA 82324 909/463-3346 909/433-3345 – fax <a href="mailto:Hsmith@3ESD.co.sanberna">Hsmith@3ESD.co.sanberna</a></p>	<p>1. Transporting public assistance recipients to work and to appointments (medical, legal, JESD) during non-traditional hours.</p> <p>2. Smaller buses which serve remote areas.</p> <p>1, 2. Please refer to the replies given to comments 14 and 36.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<a href="http://rdino.ca.us">rdino.ca.us</a>	<p>Later service hours. 5:30 a.m. 12:30 a.m.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>RTP is ambitious. Do you have the funding to complete?</p>	<p>3.</p> <p>The 2001 RTP relies on a public funding strategy as well as innovative public-private partnership efforts to support planned projects.</p>
80. Carson Community Center Community Dialogue Thursday, January 25, 2001	<p>1.</p> <p>Is EIR taking into consideration transportation-related health issues?</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Would the Maglev be above the existing Metrorail? Would the Metrolink be continued?</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>The 2001 RTP PEIR evaluates potential physical environmental impacts of the plan including noise and air quality.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>The proposed Maglev system is consistent with the three-tier transit concept originally identified in the 1978 RTP. Major station sites are proposed to have direct inter-line connections to the Metrolink System and to accommodate transit access via circulators, smart shuttles, line-haul transit and rapid-bus services.</p>
81. West San Gabriel Valley Environmental Justice Workshop Community Dialogue Thursday, January 25, 2001	<p>1.</p> <p>First consideration should be given to solutions that have no or minimal impacts to the surrounding communities near freeway construction projects, such as decking freeways if expansion is needed.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>HOV lanes should be maintained with more programs to encourage the public to carpool more regularly.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>There should be designated truck lanes on all freeways and the trucks should be required to stay out of the number one and two lanes. Something more should also be</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>While the RTP proposes a number of freeway and arterial widening projects, the actual form that the improvements take (whether it be double-decking or at-grade widening) is determined on a project-by-project basis once the implementing agencies actually begin design and construction activities.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Dedicated truck lanes need to be studied to determine if they would provide the anticipated benefits, including reduced emissions, fewer accidents, less congestion, and lower cost trucking operations. While the 2001 RTP provides a policy framework for investment in</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	done to have gravel trucks cover their dirt and rock loads more effectively so windshields on the freeway aren't broken.	<p>our transportation system, Caltrans should address day-to-day operational and safety issues on our freeway system.</p> <p>Comments noted. The RTP does include plans for truck lanes on SR-60 and I-15, and truck lane feasibility studies for I-710 and I-5. The Plan also includes truck climbing lanes on SR-57 and I-15, and in addition truck climbing lanes are already programmed in the RTIP for I-215, I-10, and another segment of I-15. This does not preclude other truck lanes from being planned, studied, or implemented under future RTPs, depending upon need.</p> <p>Present laws require trucks to remain in the outer two lanes of the freeway (regardless of how many lanes are provided), and this would be enforced by the CHP.</p> <p>This problem will be brought to the attention of SCAG's Goods Movement Advisory Committee.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>Taxing alternative fuels would discourage public use when cleaner running vehicles is what is needed.</p> <p>The potential heavy market penetration of alternative fuel vehicles would further reduce limited public funds for transportation, requiring a reassessment of providing tax incentives. SCAG is simply saying that as alternative fuel vehicles become more prevalent on the roads, costs for road repair should be proportional to use. SCAG is pursuing state budget augmentation for further study of such an option.</p>
82.	Redondo Beach Public Works Commission Meeting Thursday, January 25, 2001	<p>1. ITS – why is the South Bay included? There have been plans for 10 years for ITS improvements but nothing has been implemented.</p> <p>2. GreenLine – are there plans for the GreenLine to extend to the South Bay</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>3. What is the status of the bike path from Torrance/Anza through the Edison right-of-way to Manhattan Beach Blvd.? When will it break ground?</p> <p>4. Signal synchronization is a good idea.</p> <p>5. Are truck lanes more costly than car lanes? Why are we building truck lanes?</p>	<p>3. The 2001 RTP addresses long-range policy and investment issues relative to non-motorized transportation. Specific project issues should be addressed to the implementing agencies; the MTA in this case.</p> <p>4. See response number 1 above.</p> <p>5. Truck lanes are included in the RTP in order to reduce peak hour delay and unsafe traffic conditions relating to the interweaving of trucks and automobiles; to handle the growing numbers of trucks; to improve truck throughput; and to ensure continued vitality of goods movement, by moving freight with less congestion and delay.</p> <p>Total project costs for truck and car lanes vary from project to project. On the other hand, trucks are expected to pay roughly 30% of construction costs through tolls when constructed on existing freeways. However, cost of constructing truck lanes as opposed to regular auto-lanes at the same location does not vary significantly. Furthermore, dedicated truck lanes were indicated to be the most effective way to reduce congestion impacts where truck volumes are substantial, per studies of performance indicators applied to projects in the '98 RTP.</p> <p>6. Can we make sure there are double left turn lanes on 190<sup>th</sup> street to Inglewood?</p>
83. SCAG Regional Advisory Council Wednesday, January 17,	<p>1. Concern about goods movement and truck lanes and the risk for cancer. 89 to 90% of</p>	<p>1. The environmental justice analysis of the plan takes into account all the future truck and vehicle traffic in the region. This analysis did</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
2001  the cancer is caused by transportation services – this information is from an air study. 70% of the cancer is generated from diesel (of the 90%). This is an environmental justice issue.  2. Please review the environmental justice analysis of air pollutants by corridor and community – we need this information.  3. The Gateway cities is an area of great concern about air pollution. This is a major concern relative to the risk for cancer and air quality. There needs to be environmental justice analysis and air quality analysis.  4. I have a concern about the grade separation projects --the costs of utility relocation for these projects are not factored in. These costs should be shared by the project instead of being passed on to ratepayers. Plus the contractors building these projects are not accountable and are not looking for the most cost-effective means to relocate utilities.  5.	not show a disproportionate impact from diesel exhaust (heavy-duty vehicle exhaust particulates) in minority and low-income areas. These results are presented in Appendix I of the Regional Transportation Plan, pp. I-22 through I-26 and Figure I-10.	<p>2. The environmental justice analysis of air pollutants was done by considering all the impacts in each transportation analysis zone (generally small areas based on census tracts. Thus the analysis accounts for localized impacts. Since SCAG must demonstrate that the regional plan meets environmental justice criteria, the analysis is based on the impacts of the total transportation system, not on the local effects of individual projects. Individual projects must each go through their own environmental review and approval process.</p> <p>3. The Gateway Cities are included in the environmental justice analysis documented in Appendix I to the Regional Transportation Plan. This analysis did not show any disproportionate environmental justice impacts from air quality changes associated with the plan.</p> <p>4. The costs of utility relocation are included in the final design cost estimates for railroad grade separation projects. However, a gas company representative brought to the attention of the Goods Movement Advisory Committee the fact that the utility is in fact required to pay for part of the relocation cost of gas lines, according to city ordinance or regulation. Oversight of contractors is up to the implementing agency. Note that alternative designs are considered by the county commissions and other implementing agencies to reduce overall costs as one of the criteria for selecting final design.</p> <p>5.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>There are also water concerns – the small utility companies cannot bear the burden of these relocation costs.</p>	<p>Utility relocation is often a considerable portion of the total cost of project development. Project proponents (i.e., County Transportation Commissions, Caltrans, etc.) of grade separation projects will be required to work with utility providers in ensuring that relocation is performed in an acceptable manner by contractors and that impacts to utility users are minimized to the extent practicable and feasible. SCAG has no authority to control utility relocation costs.</p> <p>6. How many funding phases are there for the Maglev project?</p> <p>7, 8, 9 I have a concern about how SCAG is communicating messages about the transit funding and the percentage of the population that uses transit. We need to invest in transit to increase or maintain ridership.</p> <p>8. We need to look at attracting transit ridership and how we're getting people out of their cars.</p> <p>9. We need a system that can accommodate people to get them out of their cars. Transit isn't convenient.</p> <p>6. At the direction of SCAG's Regional Council, public funding of the Maglev proposed system was limited to planning; environmental clearances; use of existing publicly owned ROWs; and innovative finance strategies that would not use existing State revenue sources. It is estimated that the LAX-March Line could be fully operational by 2010.</p> <p>7, 8, 9 The creation of measures that will increase ridership of public transit is one of the highest priorities for SCAG. This is why SCAG's transit development philosophy focuses on services that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-available for use when customers want them</li> <li>-accessible by customers without major obstacles (physical, institutional, or informational)</li> <li>-planned from the customers point of view</li> </ul> <p>Transit is not always as convenient as door-to-door service provided by a private automobile. However, SCAG has made a number of suggestions for change that would enhance the quality of service currently provided to passengers. A number of the changes suggested by SCAG are listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># Better schedule adherence. Buses should arrive within five minutes of the published time. Where this is not practical, realistic schedules should be published.</li> </ul>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>## Bus stops should be physically adequate to accommodate passenger access and egress, as well as minimize auto/bus conflicts (even if this means the removal of parking) and should be free of pedestrian impediments.</p> <p>## Regional transit vehicles should be equipped with Intelligent Transportation System (ITS) technology where this adds to on-time reliability and/or operating efficiencies.</p> <p>## Bus priority service (transitway or rapid bus) should be implemented concurrently with smart street technology.</p> <p>## On corridors or arterials that are used by multiple operators, operators, should consider coordinated ticketing to enable “open door” policies.</p> <p>## Fare structures should be coordinated when possible to create a seamless regional transit network.</p>	<p>Additionally, SCAG has recommended a number of other measures to encourage the use of public transit like employer-based incentives, differential transit fare(e.g. charging one-half fare during off-peak operating hours), and the aggressive marketing of services.</p> <p>10. Comment concerning alternative fuel tax noted.</p> <p>11. The proposed alternative fuels tax is counterproductive to getting people to use transit.</p> <p>11. I have a concern about the public participation plan for the RTP. The RTP outreach program is inadequate. (Ron Ketcham)</p> <p>11. SCAG undertook an extensive public outreach program with a total of 122 meetings held throughout the region.</p>
84.	SCAG Regional Advisory Council	Charles Gale
	October 18, 2000	1. Will the SANBAG video be available?
		Hugo Morris

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>2. What part of the 1998 RTP has/hasn't been implemented? Were there components from the 1998 RTP that weren't implemented incorporated into the 2001 RTP?</p> <p>3. Why is the RTP so important?</p>	<p>2. There were a number of projects in the 1998 RTP that haven't been implemented. Naturally, all major projects with estimated completion dates beyond 2005 have not been implemented. Where possible, components of the 1998 RTP that weren't implemented have been incorporated into the 2001 RTP.</p> <p>3. The RTP is required by the federal and state governments, with particular respect to the achievement of air quality conformity goals set out by the State Implementation Plan. The RTP is required to ensure federal and state funding for transportation in the region.</p> <p>4. Comment noted. SCAG undertook extensive public outreach in connection with the RTP. A total of 122 meetings were held throughout the region.</p>
	<p>4.</p> <p>Made a motion to the RAC:        # Motion to recommend to the RAC to conduct outreach activities targeting underserved communities for the RTP and allocate resources as necessary.</p>	<p>5. Such access will be granted to LAC members.</p> <p>David Mootchnik</p> <p>5. Request that RAC members have access to the secure project website.</p>
		<p>6. What form are the public comments in and provided to SCAG?</p> <p>Marilyn Carpenter</p> <p>7.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>Use simple language when presenting the RTP</p> <p>8. Requests a copy of the RAC presentation</p> <p>9. Feels "hopeful" about the outreach approaches and targeted audiences</p> <p>10. Thank you for recognizing the RAC as a partner</p> <p>11. Concern about February "cut off" for comments – will the RTP schedule be adjusted?</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Kathleen Gildred</p> <p>12. The public appreciated SCAG's public forums</p> <p>13. 450 people attended the public forums and the list is growing</p> <p>14. Concern that the City of Los Angeles and Westside Cities did not participate in first phase of RTP outreach since RAC's network is strongest in those areas</p> <p>15. Wants to continue organizing the public</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>forums and will focus the forums on the RTP, using the media to publicize them.</p> <p>16. Sending welcome letters to the Regional Citizenry</p> <p>Benetta Johnson</p> <p>17. Concern that the RTP outreach efforts are not including inner city areas such as South Central, Compton, Carson, Vernon, Huntington Park and San Pedro.</p> <p>18. What is the impact of the RTP on cities surrounding the Alameda Corridor?</p> <p>19. An organization in Watts has the capacity to house an electronic townhall meeting</p> <p>20. Doesn't believe the RTP outreach team can effectively work with inner city communities</p> <p>Sheryl Monaghan</p> <p>21. Thinks the RTP outreach is inadequate</p> <p>22.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>23. SCAG needs to pay organizations in the inner city to conduct the outreach to reach the “grass roots”.</p> <p>24. RTP outreach has been “wide but not deep” thus far</p> <p>25. The “money from SCAG should trickle down” to the inner city.</p>	<p>The RTP outreach team is not effective reaching inner city communities.</p> <p>Bob Farrell</p> <p>26. Can a RAC strategy get money to fund outreach in the areas (choosing) not to participate?</p> <p>Richard Shawson</p> <p>28. The RTP message is a complicated message to any community, not just EJ audiences because the average person doesn’t care and is not interested and cannot grasp the issue of transportation planning.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	29. RAC members should provide suggestions to the RTP outreach team of organizations to contact.	
	30. Need money to make more effective outreach to occur	1. Comment noted. See response 4 to Joan Hoesterey.
85.		1. The seniors would like a more integrated transportation system between South Bay cities. There is too much confusion and boundary lines when it comes to transportation. Is it possible to create a system which allows seniors to go from one city to another and require only one voucher?
86.	Gary R. Cornell Glendale Homeowners Coordinating Council 1000 E. Mountain Glendale, CA	1. Prevent gridlock most important transportation concern.  2. Transportation issue to address: Some kind of incentive to get drivers to double up in ridership. Some incentives to get drivers out of their own personal vehicles.  3. Need more review on RTP, however, I feel positive as far as the preliminary review of this meeting.
87.	James M. Smith Native Sons of the Golden	1. Congestion on freeway too much emphasis  Comment noted.

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
West P. O. Box 9824 San Bernardino, CA 92427 909/882-7025	<p>on public transportation.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Better off/on ramps.</p>	<p>2. Comment noted. Approximately two years ago an embryonic form of automated guidance was demonstrated on the I-15 in San Diego County. This test was developed by GM/Hughes and demonstrated the "Car Train" concept. Although interesting, this technology has a 50-year development horizon according to General Motors.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Comment concerning finance noted.</p>
88. Pastor Joshua Beckley Inland Empire Concerned Afro-American Churches 1314 E. Date Street San Bernardino, CA 92404 909/881-5557 909/881-0199 – fax	<p>Seems to address the concerns within its financial constraints/should be skewed away from public transportation.</p>	<p>1, 2, 3.</p> <p>Comments noted. Several new Rapid Bus Lines are in the Plan and with these lines will come minor restructuring to feed into the express system.</p> <p>Part of the Rapid Bus program includes the use of Intelligent Transportation System technology that will post "real time" bus schedule e.g. next bus in ... minutes.</p> <p>1.</p> <p>Close and immediate access to buses, etc., on the Westside and throughout the Westside communities.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Smart bus stops and a more consideration of the westside issues in future transportation.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Seems to be a great plan, if the issues of the westside and other under served communities are involved.</p>
89. Ed Blevins San Bernardino Scottish Rite 4400 N. Varsity Avenue San Bernardino, CA 92407 909/887-4415		<p>1-3.</p> <p>Comments noted. The plans focus is to provide an attractive alternative to the auto and proposes many public transit enhancements and projects to accomplish this.</p> <p>1.</p> <p>Remove obstacles to rapid movements of people</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Items discussed need to be included in plan.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Means to get autos off freeways need added</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
90.	Deborah Barmack SANBAG 472 N Arrowhead Avenue San Bernardino, CA 92401	<p>1. Increasing truck congestion. Need for investments to make public transit convenient emphasis.</p> <p>Truck lanes are included in the RTP in order to reduce peak hour delay and unsafe traffic conditions relating to the interweaving of trucks and automobiles; to handle the growing numbers of trucks; to improve truck throughput; and to ensure continued vitality of goods movement, by moving freight with less congestion and delay. The RTP includes plans for truck lanes on SR-60 and I-15, and truck lane feasibility studies for I-710 and I-5. The Plan also includes truck climbing lanes on SR-57 and I-15, and in addition truck climbing lanes are already programmed in the RTIP for I-215, I-10, and another segment of I-15.</p> <p>2. Is the Plan realistic and how to educate public about the need to change existing transportation funding mechanisms.</p>
91.	Joe Suarez, Jr. Councilmember City of San Bernardino 3105 Belmont Avenue San Bernardino, CA 92407 909/887-8790	<p>1. Most important transportation concern is growth and gridlock.</p> <p>2. It seems as if you are doing the best you can and it seems as if this Plan will work.</p>
92.	Betty Dean Anderson Councilmember City of San Bernardino 300 N. "D" Street San Bernardino, CA 92418 909/384-5378	<p>1. Most important concern is that (transportation) it has not become a very high priority item in the political arena.</p> <p>2.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	909/384-5105 – fax  909/384-5031 909/384-5160 – fax	<p>Extend to establish an ad hoc committee to discuss transportation issues at another level.</p> <p>3. Fast Track all Plans.</p> <p>1,2. SCAG is concerned with the transit needs of all people including the specific needs of Seniors. Our region will see a rise in the elderly (65 and older) population to 15.4% in 2025, up from 9.9% in 1997. The elimination of privately operated services would likely be a disservice to Seniors. This is not however saying that improvements to these types of services are not needed. SCAG would support the creation of quality control measures such as random and unannounced checks of drivers to assure that they are meeting the needs of their passengers.</p>
93.	John A. Kramer San Bernardino Parks, Rec. & Community Services 547 N. Sierra Way San Bernardino, CA 92410  909/384-5031 909/384-5160 – fax	<p>1. Elimination of dial-a-cab; senior citizen transportation needs are transportation concerns.</p> <p>2. Provide funding to local municipalities to run their own senior shuttle programs.</p> <p>1. Please refer to the reply to comment #54.</p> <p>2. The Regional Transit Task Force will continue on after the plan is final. The Task Force's focus will be on holding public workshops where speakers from all over the region and nation will come to the table to discuss their experiences.</p> <p>The plan proposes a large emphasis should be placed on feeder service to all train stations, light rail and commuter rail.</p>
94.	Gary H. Kelly SBVC 701 S. Mt. Vernon Avenue San Bernardino, CA  909/888-6511 909/885-5450 – fax	<p>1. Low cost public transportation which will increase ridership;</p> <p>2. Look at areas that have low cost public transportation (St. Louis to Illinois from airport 511.Japan Shinkansen (bullet) trains) – the trains travel rapid speeds because of angling track rather than turns or curves. Bus and taxi service at each stop.</p> <p>1. Bikeways are not shown on the region-wide RTP maps because of the scale of the maps. However, the RTP includes substantial (over \$700 million) funding for bikeways.</p> <p>2.</p>
95.	Torrance Traffic Commission	<p>1. Why do bikeways go to the end of the city boundaries on the maps? Why are bikeways not shown regionwide?</p> <p>2.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>You should publicize the RTP availability on the Torrance city cable station. You should also do the presentation on cable so more people could be aware of the project.</p> <p>3. What is the status of air quality in our region?</p> <p>4. What is the impact of the electricity crisis and power outages on the RTP project?</p> <p>5. Specifically, what are the plans and commitment to bikeways in the Plan?</p> <p>6. Why isn't there more emphasis of public surface transportation and connections with bikeways? Like using the bus and connecting with bikes?</p>	<p>SCAG undertook an extensive public outreach effort including 122 community meetings.</p> <p>3. The South Coast Air Basin (SCAB) (excluding Banning Pass) is a non-attainment area for the pollutants and/or air quality including CO (attainment year 2000), 1-hour ozone (attainment year 2010), NO<sub>2</sub> (attainment year 1995), and PM<sub>10</sub> (attainment year 2006). The air quality status for this basin and other air basins in the region are identified in the 2001 RTP, Appendix H.</p> <p>4. The impact of the electricity crisis on the RTP is unknown at this time. Projects most likely affected would include those that require electrified guideways.</p> <p>5-6. SCAG is committed to supporting and encouraging the use of non-motorized transportation which consists primarily of bicycling, walking and jogging. This is evident in the focus on Livable Communities Strategy. An important aspect of creating sustainable, livable communities is making them both pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly. SCAG's Livable Communities Subcommittee was created to address how to quantify "livability" at a regional scale as the impacts of the strategies are realized at a neighborhood or community scale.</p> <p>SCAG's commitment to increased use of non-motorized transportation in the region is also evident in the proposed spending in the 2001 RTP. The 2001 RTP includes an increase in spending from the current spending levels. In the Strategic Investments section, SCAG has recommended eight actions specifically designed to encourage the use of non-motorized transportation. These</p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>recommended actions should be used as the starting point for the development of specific projects at the local level. In general, non-motorized transportation has been constrained. While the commitment level proposed in the plan for livable communities and non-motorized transportation may not appear adequate depending based on a specific perspective, the plan proposes a balanced approach within the financial means identified.</p> <p>The RTP proposes over \$700 million in bikeways regionwide. The actual design and construction of bikeways will be carried out by the implementing agencies such as the County Transportation Commissions and local governments.</p> <p>7. Naturally, the use of bicycles instead of automobiles provides benefits to the region in terms of reduced congestion and improved air quality. SCAG has not done an analysis to specifically identify the tradeoffs between automobile use and bicycle use.</p> <p>8-13. Comment noted. Local traffic issues such as speed limit signs are under the authority of individual city governments.</p> <p>7. What is the analysis of bikeway usage versus car usage if people used their bikes instead of driving?</p> <p>8. We want local feeder buses serving larger bus routes.</p> <p>9. Why can't I take public transportation (bus) from West Torrance to downtown Los Angeles?</p> <p>10. There is no bus service feeding the Green Line station at Marine.</p> <p>11. We want bus stop signs to identify frequency for services so if we just miss the bus, we know how long it will take for the</p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>12. We want buses with bike racks on them</p> <p>13. Street signs should be posted stating what speed limit the signals are set to (signal synchronization).</p> <p>14. Change delivery time of trucks to non-peak hours, particularly during the middle of the night like we did during the 1984 Olympics to alleviate congestion on the I-710 and I-605.</p>
96. WRCOG Community Dialogue January 11, 2001 7 – 9 a.m.		<p>1. When are airports going to develop Ontario and make it a “real” international airport?</p> <p>2. Costs of the proposed projects.</p> <p>3. Will any communities be disenfranchised due to the proposed projects?</p>
97. Las Virgenes/Malibu COG Calabasas City Hall 26135 Mureau Road Calabasas, CA 91302		<p>1. Since the mass transit has been viewed at the “inferior good” how the RTP is looking at changing this sociological factor to</p> <p>1. In developing the transit plan for the region SCAG is aware that transit is considered an inferior economic good and that this creates a barrier to increasing ridership. Many of the actions SCAG has</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
June 20, 2000 10:00 a.m. – 12:00 noon	encourage usage.	<p>proposed in the update of the RTP will help to improve the quality of the transit services provided and help to combat the idea that public transit is an inferior good. These improvements range from ensuring that buses arrive within five minutes of the time printed on transit schedules, providing security for park and ride facilities, employer incentive programs, as well as better and more aggressive marketing of these transit services to make people aware of there transportation options.</p> <p>2-4.</p> <p>Comments noted. The RTP is a regional plan that focuses on regionwide issues such as mobility and air quality. While there may not be any visible benefits for the sub-region in question, residents may benefit from improvements in air quality, faster commute times and less congestion on the freeways, and so on.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Growth in the sub-region</p> <p>4.</p> <p>RTP needs to recognize the needs of the sub-region (RTP seems to have no visible benefits for the sub-region)</p> <p>5.</p> <p>Transit's self-sufficiency</p> <p>6.</p> <p>MAGLEV/Automatic guidance for automobiles</p> <p>7.</p> <p>Clear signage to reduce mileage.</p>
98. Las Virgenes/Malibu COG Malibu City Hall 23555 Civic Center Way Malibu, CA 90265 June 20, 2000 2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.		<p>1-15.</p> <p>Comments noted. The RTP sets forth a long-range plan for transportation improvements that address regional concerns such as mobility, accessibility, safety, and air quality. However, local traffic measures and improvements such as traffic lights, turn lanes, traffic directors, and shoulder closures are under the authority of individual</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>3. More traffic lights on PCH</p> <p>4. Reduce speed limit/more speed limit signs on PCH</p> <p>5. Eliminate/Control bike lane on PCH</p> <p>6. Crowded Ventura Freeway resulted in crowded PCH-alternative transportation needed for the Ventura Freeway</p> <p>7. Rail system on the Ventura Freeway that would lift Z traffic from PCH</p> <p>8. One public agency having jurisdiction over PCH from third tunnel to Ventura to better respond to emergencies and for traffic control</p> <p>9. Intelligent control system on PCH</p> <p>10. Congestion on PCH resulted in air pollution</p> <p>11. Control avoidable traffic tie-ups that create hazards on PCH</p>	<p>city governments. The US-101 freeway is identified as a long-range corridor in the RTP, and it is the subject of a Major Investment Study that will soon be under way.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>12. Wide shoulders current existing on PCH or Malibu Canyon Road should not be sacrificed</p> <p>13. Require all crews to utilize the center median on PCH to create a substitute second lane that keeps traffic flowing</p> <p>14. Z traffic and beach traffic on Malibu Canyon Road</p> <p>15. Create licensed traffic directors whose responsibility would be to keep traffic safely moving during emergencies and other needed times</p> <p>16. Connect regional transportation link to Oxnard and Ventura, because many of the workers in Malibu live in these areas</p> <p>17. Limited bus service creates inability to attract workers to work in Malibu</p> <p>18. Good mass transit system that people of middle and upper income can also access</p> <p>1. 405 Freeway congestion between LAX and the 10 Freeway</p> <p>1. Comment noted. The baseline includes HOV lanes on I-405.</p>
99. South Bay Cities COG Community Dialogue City of Hawthorne	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
3901 El Segundo Blvd. Hawthorne, CA 90250 June 15, 2000 4:30 – 6:30 p.m.	<p>2. Congestion on Hawthorne Blvd.</p> <p>3. Aviation/Airport – LAX</p> <p>4. Different ways to produce revenues besides revitalization through development, i.e., Rosecrans Avenue congestion in Manhattan Beach, Hawthorne and Lawndale</p> <p>5. Rosecrans Avenue development near the 405 Freeway</p> <p>6. Bus service doesn't get people where they want to go</p>	<p>2-5. Comment noted</p> <p>6. SCAG is in support of designing all transportation from the customer's perspective. This would help assure that transit lines take passengers to their desired destinations.</p> <p>A study of Jitney/Shuttle services will be conducted in the next calendar year. Jitney services could help to take transit riders to a greater variety of destinations because they are on-demand personal transit services.</p> <p>7. Demographics in RTP not addressed, e.g. aging population</p> <p>8. Other issues not addressed in RTP:</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>Weekend congestion and air quality</p> <p>9. Travel patterns</p> <p>10. Disability issues and accessibility</p> <p>11. Provide transit information to major locations</p> <p>12. Inadequate marketing of transit information (recurring issue during discussion)</p> <p>13. Transit marketing issues not addressed in RTP</p> <p>14. Address smaller projects that make big projects work</p> <p>15. Look at transportation regionally, but need to ensure local support or fill local need</p> <p>16. Buses get caught up in congestion unless</p>	<p>While weekend congestion is often a significant problem, the capacity of the transportation system is geared towards handling traffic during the peak periods.</p> <p>Currently the SCAQMD is in the process of developing weekend emission data as related to on-road travel. Emissions associated with weekend travel may be included in the upcoming 2001 AQMP if the data is available.</p> <p>9. Comment noted.</p> <p>10. Please refer to the reply to comment # 11.</p> <p>11-13. In the 2001 RTP, SCAG recommends that transit providers take action to aggressively market services where public transit offers a viable alternative to automobile use.</p> <p>14-15. SCAG's primary purpose is to create an integrated regional transit system on the county level. Local needs are better addressed to the appropriate county transit commission or county transit provider.</p> <p>16.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>there is bus-only lane</p> <p>17. Streets don't accommodate buses well in South Bay</p> <p>18. Some buses are underutilized-maybe smaller buses on smaller streets</p> <p>19. Not only look at where people are living, but where they are working The following were identified as priority issues:</p> <p>20. Not enough bus service to employment centers</p> <p>21. Airport – LAX expansion</p> <p>22. Urban rail system (red car)</p> <p>23. Dedicated bus ways</p> <p>24. Costs of local fixed-route service, i.e. Lawndale trolley</p> <p>25. Local feeder "shuttle" service to major bus</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>17-18. Areas such as the South Bay are ideal for shuttle services/circulators because of the infrastructure. The MTA proposes an increase in shuttle/circulators for 2025 and SCAG supports this public transit option.</p> <p>19-20. SCAG realizes the importance of serving major attraction generators like employment centers. The Regional Transit Task Force will be taking a more in-depth look at this service need in the future. The group will be looking at policies and structure changes that may help to develop this service.</p> <p>21-24. Comment noted.</p> <p>25.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>routes and rail systems</p> <p>26. South Bay as destination or through-way</p> <p>27. Not enough transit service</p> <p>28. Frequency of bus service</p> <p>29. Service on Greenline</p> <p>30. Marketing transit/accessing information</p> <p>31. Transit corridors not efficient</p> <p>32. Coordinated planning/region-wide</p> <p>33.</p>	<p>SCAG will be conducting a study of jitney/shuttle services which may find that these services could help to feed passengers into major bus routes and rail system.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>More frequent service will be necessary to support the growth the region will see by 2025. The plan proposes a 40% increase in transit trips. In order to achieve this goal SCAG has proposed increases in service on all modes of public transportation.</p> <p>More frequent service will be necessary to support the growth the region will see by 2025. The plan supports this.</p> <p>There will be increased service on the Green Line in the future. There are plans to extend the Green Line to LAX as well as long range plans to extend the line south into the South Bay.</p> <p>30-31, 35. See response to 11-13 above.</p> <p>32.</p> <p>SCAG believes that transit corridors can and do improve mobility especially when Intelligent Transportation Technology is applied to the corridors. SCAG realizes that the local bus system, is the backbone of the transit network. However, certain transit corridors like Wilshire with the new Rapid Bus have seen about a 15% increase in ridership.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>Priority of high speed rail over MAGLEV because MAGLEV is untested technology and no such vehicle exists</p> <p>34. Regional and local transit collaboration and support</p> <p>35. Transit promotion</p>	<p>33. The Transrapid International (TRI) Maglev train has been operated in daily revenue service on its 20km facility in Bremen Germany over the last 24 months. The Federal Republic of Germany has certified the TRI train for passenger service.</p> <p>34. Comment noted.</p> <p>35. Comment noted.</p> <p>1-2. Coordination between agencies and cities:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Not much interaction between Beach Cities – would like to see more coordination between cities such as Hawthorne, Torrance, Lawndale, Gardena and other South Bay cities</li> <li>2. Want to see coordinated service between cities in South Bay</li> <li>3. Construction coordination to address traffic flow, i.e. PCH construction – why traffic flow has not been coordinated on other streets such as Aviation, Artesia, Manhattan Beach Blvd., etc.</li> <li>4. Bicycles:</li> <li>5. Wider lanes to accommodate bicycles</li> </ol> <p>4-7. SCAG is committed to supporting and encouraging the use of non-motorized transportation which consists primarily of bicycling, walking and jogging. This is evident in the focus on Livable</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>Not enough capacity for bikes on trains and buses</p> <p>Pedestrians</p> <p>6. Street signals need to have clicking signals for the blind; not enough time for pedestrians to cross streets, especially for seniors</p> <p>7. Motion detectors for pedestrians to cross streets</p> <p>Transportation programs/public transit and their accessibility to seniors:</p> <p>8. Access Services need improvement in terms of service – late, not patient with riders, not on time, more insight</p> <p>9. More services similar to Access Services</p> <p>10. Need transportation system that is reliable for seniors and older adults</p> <p>11. Mobility for seniors a major issue – many seniors are socially isolated</p> <p>12. Need assistance getting on/off bus</p>	<p>Communities Strategy. An important aspect of creating sustainable, livable communities is making them both pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly. SCAG's Livable Communities Subcommittee was created to address how to quantify "livability" at a regional scale as the impacts of the strategies are realized at a neighborhood or community scale.</p> <p>SCAG's commitment to increased use of non-motorized transportation in the region is also evident in the proposed spending in the 2001 RTP. In the Strategic Investments section, SCAG has recommended eight actions specifically designed to encourage the use of non-motorized transportation.</p> <p>8. Comment noted.</p> <p>9-14. Comment noted. Please see response to comment #93 and response 4 to Joan Hoesterey.</p> <p>10.</p> <p>11.</p> <p>12.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>13. Increase funding for transportation</p> <p>14. No really good maps showing boundaries for use of tickets for Torrance senior ride</p> <p>15. Tickets for senior ride are limiting</p> <p>16. Access to public transit is difficult; trip planner is not efficient at times</p> <p>17. Trip planner needs more detail-specific locations of bus stop, i.e. SW corner to take east bound bus</p> <p>18. Streamline process to get bus passes for seniors, disabled and mentally ill</p> <p>19. Safety on buses and trains, and at stops Aviation/LAX</p>	<p>15. SCAG does not have authority over the way a transit operator provides information to the public. SCAG does realize the importance of their marketing/information materials. We have discussed and encouraged operators to focus on marketing information efforts.</p> <p>16-18. SCAG's mandate does not give it the power to change the way in which transit providers distribute passes. However, SCAG believes that all obstacles to transit should be eliminated. If the procedure to obtain passes is too difficult for any group of people then SCAG fully supports the streamlining of the process.</p> <p>19. Building on the 1998 RTP several goals were added to improve mobility. One of the goals is to serve the public's transportation needs in safe, reliable and economical ways. The RTP also has performance objectives. Safety is one of these performance indicators that's objective is to have zero fatalities and injuries per million passenger miles.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>20. Low flying planes in the middle of nights (2:00-4:00 a.m.) and residents are not notified</p> <p>21. Small planes hauling banners over Hermosa Beach 8-9 hours a day on weekends, making inland turnarounds</p> <p>22. Traffic at airport; paramedics could not get to patient at LAX because of congestion</p> <p>23. Noise from planes in neighborhoods Ports</p> <p>24. Consider off-hour egress from port at night and off-peak hours on the 110 and 710 freeways</p> <p>Other issues:</p> <p>25. Need dedicated lane for small electric cars</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>20-23.</p> <p>The RTP supports improvements in freight movement productivity, including the use of extended hours of delivery.</p> <p>SCAG supports ways to promote the use of alternative-fuel vehicles such as electric cars, which will help meet regional air quality goals. Current market incentives exist that support the purchase of electric cars. While it may not be feasible to have dedicated lanes only for electric cars, there has in the past been some support for having such vehicles use HOV lanes. However, the purpose of HOV lanes is to promote ridesharing to improve mobility.</p> <p>Want to see seniors included in task forces and the transportation planning process;</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	take into account population is getting older  27. Placement of signals on ramps should be reconsidered	27. Comment noted.
101.  Ron Perkins City of La Quinta 48-213 Calle Floristas La Quinta, CA 92253 760/564-1887 760/564-0055 – fax	1. Traffic congestion; reckless disregard for traffic laws; red lights, speed, slow vehicles on number 1 lane is a most important concern.	1-4. Comments noted. While the RTP addresses congestion and safety at the regional level, the actual implementation and enforcement of traffic laws rests with local authorities.
	2. Increased use of motor officers	
	3. Increased traffic enforcement	
	4. I think it is good we should go forward with RTP.	1, 2, 3, 4. Some of the truck movements impacting Anaheim may result from trucks including marine containers moving over the 91 Freeway to the 57 Freeway and north towards the Inland Empire. The Plan proposes to provide an alternative route via the SR-60 truck lanes. Also, with regard to truck traffic that has to move through this part of Orange County, the Plan includes auxiliary lane improvements on SR-91 and SR-57, widening of I-5 just west of Anaheim, and extension of toll lanes along SR-91 east of Orange County, which would provide additional freeway capacity through this part of Orange County.
		Regarding the rail traffic increase, the Plan proposes railroad grade crossing improvements including grade separations, along the Orangethorpe Corridor.
	5.	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
103.  Susan Robles Burbank Transportation Commission 1830 Richard Street Burbank, CA 91504 626/660-3859	<p>Need more time to evaluate RTP</p> <p>1. Job access most important transportation concern</p> <p>2. Need to address education to all on alternatives</p> <p>3. Your presenters should speak in plain, non-regional planner language, jargon and technical terms do not belong in public meetings, especially informational presentations.</p> <p>4. Your speaker presented very strong opinions. I expected this meeting to be information and not as focused on propaganda like rhetoric. I was highly dissatisfied.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The last day to submit comments was March 15<sup>th</sup>. The TCC will meet to consider the plan April 5, the Regional Council will meet to consider the Plan April 12. Public testimony will be taken at both meetings.</p> <p>1. The plan will provide about an 8% improvement in accessibility to jobs throughout the region. Accessibility is defined as the percentage of the region's jobs reachable within 30 minutes by car or within 45 minutes by transit.</p> <p>2, 3, 4. Comments noted.</p> <p>1.2. Comment noted. The 2001 RTP includes improvements designed to improve operations of the regional transportation network. The 2001 RTP PEIR evaluates impacts of the RTP including traffic, air quality and noise.</p>
104.  Daniel Walker 7416 West 82 <sup>nd</sup> Street Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/416-6919 310/364-6128 – fax <a href="mailto:daniel.walker2@boeing.com">daniel.walker2@boeing.com</a>	<p>1.</p> <p>We are concerned about crowded freeways and streets in LA and Orange County not just during rush hour but all day long. Traffic and air pollution will get worse unless we improve our transportation infrastructure throughout Southern</p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>2.</p> <p>Will a few NIMBY's irrational fears prevent LA MTA and OCTA from completing freeway missing gaps, widening, carpool lanes and rail projects?</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Build Expo Light Rail from Blue Line to Santa Monica on existing MTA right of way. Convert Harbor subdivision MTA owned tracks from freight to passenger service from San Pedro to LAX to Union Station. Extend Green Line from Aviation station to LAX to the new West LAX terminal. Then continue the Green Line north from LAX along Lincoln Blvd. To Playa Vista, Marina del Rey, Venice, to Santa Monica. Extend the East LA Light Rail from Union Station to Whittier. Extend the Pasadena Light Rail to Claremont. Extend the metro red line north in the San Fernando Valley to connect with Metrolink station in Burbank. Connect red line North Hollywood station to Warner Center via Light Rail (not busway) on existing MTA Chandler right of way. Connect Warner Center to Chatsworth Metrolink via Light Rail. Extend the red line subway west to Century City and Westwood Village. Extend the red line subway south under Vermont Blvd., to connect w/the green line. Complete missing gap of 710 freeway through South Pasadena. Widen freeways to complete</p>	<p>The RTP has been changed to incorporate the MTA long range plan. The corridors mentioned by the commenter are mostly within the Baseline, Plan or long range list.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	missing carpool lanes in LA and Orange counties. Connect carpool lanes at all major freeway interchanges.	<p>4. The RTP to include the vital transportation projects listed above. Identify potential sources of funding to pay for these projects.</p> <p>1. Comment noted. The US-101 freeway is identified as a long-range corridor in the RTP, and it is the subject of a Major Investment Study that will soon be under way.</p> <p>2. SCAG recognizes the need for a jobs/housing balance in the region and the strategies to achieve this goal look to develop housing in urban and suburban job centers while attracting high paying jobs to housing-rich communities. As part of the integrated land use, transportation, and general planning section, SCAG will help member jurisdictions apply for Jobs/Housing incentive funds from the State Department of Housing and Community Development. Also, SCAG's 2001/02 Overall Work Program includes a new Regional Housing Development program aimed at promoting more housing in jobs-rich areas.</p> <p>3. Look good, I like to see more implementation than studies on RTP</p>
105. Robert Yalda City of Calabasas 26135 Mureau Road Calabasas, CA 818/878-4225 – fax <a href="mailto:Yalda@ci.Calabasas.ca.us">Yalda@ci.Calabasas.ca.us</a>	1. 101 Corridor buildout and no alternative road is most important concern.  2. Balancing of housing needs and business buildout in region.	<p>1. Comment noted. The US-101 freeway is identified as a long-range corridor in the RTP, and it is the subject of a Major Investment Study that will soon be under way.</p> <p>2. SCAG recognizes the need for a jobs/housing balance in the region and the strategies to achieve this goal look to develop housing in urban and suburban job centers while attracting high paying jobs to housing-rich communities. As part of the integrated land use, transportation, and general planning section, SCAG will help member jurisdictions apply for Jobs/Housing incentive funds from the State Department of Housing and Community Development. Also, SCAG's 2001/02 Overall Work Program includes a new Regional Housing Development program aimed at promoting more housing in jobs-rich areas.</p> <p>3. While the RTP, a long-term planning and policy document, is prepared by SCAG, the implementation of elements of the RTP, is carried out by the County Transportation Commissions, Caltrans, and local agencies.</p>
106. Timor Rafiq Rafiq & Associates 21945 Bahamas Mission Viejo, CA 92642	1. Congestion is a transportation concern	<p>1, 2, 3. Comments noted. The RTP includes investments to fill in the HOV gaps in the system. Reduction of congestion is one of the main goals of the Plan.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	3. Great policy document	1. Comment noted.  2. SCAG supports measures to minimize delays caused by accidents. Implementation of such measures as well as ITS programs are carried out by local and county agencies.
107.  Mark Wessel City of Westlake Village 4373 Park Terrace Drive Westlake Village, CA 92361  805/653-6597 805/643-0791 – fax <a href="mailto:mwessel@willdan.com">mwessel@willdan.com</a>	1. Freeway congestion important transportation concern  2. Faster incident management; create implementation of ITS	1, 2. Comments noted.
108.  Linda Taira Caltrans – District 7 213/897-0813 213/897-1634 – fax <a href="mailto:Linda.Taira@dot.ca.gov">Linda.Taira@dot.ca.gov</a>	1. Capacity; need infrastructure/services to support growth  2. Identify regional priorities, focus on system-wide improvements	1, 2. Comments noted.
109.  Jim Thorsen City of Agoura Hills 30101 Agoura Court, Ste. 102  Agoura Hills, CA 818/597-7314 818/597-7352 – fax <a href="mailto:Jthorsen@ci.agoura-hills.ca.us">Jthorsen@ci.agoura-hills.ca.us</a>	1. Interchange upgrades most important transportation concern.  2.  Reduce study time, increase construction.	1, 2. Comments noted.
110.  Christopher Nguyen Rafig & Associates 21942 Bahamas Mission Viejo, CA 92642	1. Peak hour congestion on freeways  2. Added capacity to be addressed on	1, 2. Comments noted.

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS transportation issues.	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
111. Arroyo Verdugo Glendale City Hall February 1, 2001	<p>1. The draft RTP document is very technical so there should also be a version for the layperson and general consumption. There are too many transportation and technical terms used in the document which made the RTP difficult to understand and therefore more difficult to provide comment.</p> <p>2. There should be another public opportunity to review and comment on the revised draft RTP after the current round of public comments conclude. The results and any changes due to the collected public comments will be unknown so there is no way of determining consideration of the comments in the RTP.</p> <p>3. The Draft RTP must address housing, development, power, water and other land use issues in coordination with the transportation issues.</p> <p>4. Public transportation must be provided on a cheaper basis. Public transportation costs for limited and fixed income people are directly tied to housing costs. As housing and transportation costs rise, the poor will be forced to walk to work and the market or use bandit taxis or fall into a cycle of poverty that may lead to homelessness.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. SCAG staff have made every effort to make the RTP reader-friendly with the most technical information placed in technical appendices.</p> <p>2. The RTP will be considered at the TCC meeting April 5, 2001 and the Regional Council meeting April 12, 2001. The public will have an opportunity to comment further at that time.</p> <p>3. The RTP primarily addresses transportation infrastructure but also contains policies addressing "livable communities". The RTP PEIR addresses impacts of the RTP on housing, power, water and land use.</p> <p>4. Traditional transit systems, both bus and rail modes, currently are public sector subsidized between 50 to 100 percent of the actual trip cost. Subsidy levels as a whole or for specific rider categories are policy/political decisions.</p> <p>The decision-making for types and levels of subsidy is the responsibility of the elected or appointed boards of directors of individual transit operators or the County Transportation Commissions. Additionally, certain types of service fare discounts</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>5. With respect to the financing strategies, costs cutting measures should be examined much more closely. The four recommendations impose additional taxes with no mention of cost cutting. The strategies must include cost cutting because there is a limit to what can be paid by the public.</p> <p>6. With respect to the specific task force recommendations such as regional transit and truck lanes, public comments should be collected directly from the users and the impacted communities in addition to the service providers.</p>	<p>5. The Long-Range Transportation Finance Task Force did consider cost-cutting measures. In fact, the final 2001 RTP financial forecast incorporates many of the cost-cutting measures assumed by local county transportation planning agencies. Any further efforts to reduce costs, however, are difficult. The region continues to fall short of meeting demand for transportation services. Deferred-maintenance strategies would only increase this gap in the long-term. In recognition of the fact that public dollars are limited, SCAG advocates pursuing private-public partnership or innovative financing efforts to support transportation infrastructure needs.</p> <p>6. Comment noted. Public outreach efforts have attempted to reach such users of the system.</p>
112.	SGVCOG Central San Gabriel Valley Environmental Justice Workshop Baldwin Park Community Center	<p>1. Widening of the Pomona 60 freeway in relation to the truck lane study that was completed in the San Gabriel Valley should be opposed without further alternatives, community input, public participation and study as to the adverse impact of construction along the freeway corridor.</p> <p>The primary "provider" would be Caltrans, which is responsible for the state highway system, of which SR-60 is a part. The study had</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>2.</p> <p>The MTA should be broken up to provide more cost effective and quality service to the riding public in the region. More public transportation is going to be more expensive in the future.</p>	<p>2.</p> <p>This concept will be studied further as the efficiency of our transportation system is studied. The LACMTA will be restructuring in the future. This would include letting some lines be operated by municipal operators.</p>
<p>113. Arroyo Verdugo Cities Council of Governments Burbank Transportation Commission February 8, 2001</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>Open borders and the population growth have taxed the infrastructure, has there been thought to closing borders?</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>Comment noted. Border control and immigration are issues regulated by the federal government.</p>
	<p>2.</p> <p>Is environmental justice workable, if so, why and if not, why not?</p>	<p>2.</p> <p>Environmental justice is a fundamental expectation of the federal government in transportation planning, and it is supported by federal law, specifically the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As a regional planning agency and recipient of federal funds, SCAG must do the best it can to balance the expectations of environmental justice while also meeting air quality and fiscal constraints. SCAG's analysis shows that, in general, this goal has been met, and where the plan falls short, SCAG has attempted to mitigate impacts where possible and justify impacts otherwise.</p>
	<p>3.</p> <p>When will there be consensus on the airports and what direction will the airports go particularly on the issue of expansion?</p>	<p>3.</p> <p>Consensus on aviation appears difficult. SCAG studied several aviation scenarios. The TCC is recommending that Scenario 8 be the adopted RTP aviation scenario.</p>
	<p>4.</p> <p>What type of technology will be used for the Maglev proposal and how will it be</p>	<p>4.</p> <p>Magnetic levitation is the proposed technology for Maglev. At the direction of SCAG's Regional Council, public funding of the</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS financed?	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
114. Boyle Heights Neighborhood Assoc. February 3, 2001	<p>1. What effect bickering between the area elected officials was having on transportation policy.</p> <p>2. Concerns about 710 Freeway has not been completed as was promised.</p> <p>3. Being retired, no longer working but very concerned about children and grandchildren's transportation needs.</p> <p>4. There is a concern that we are not receiving the same services and upgrades as other parts of the city and other counties.</p> <p>5. Would like a list of all RTP outreach events, including the next 15 scheduled.</p> <p>6. The subway should go all the way to Long Beach.</p>	<p>Maglev proposed system was limited to planning; environmental clearances; use of existing publicly owned ROWs; and innovative finance strategies that would not use existing State revenue sources. All capital equipment, O&amp;M, construction and debt retirement costs will be privately financed.</p> <p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted – The RTP supports completion of the I-710 Gap Closure.</p> <p>3. Comment noted.</p> <p>4. Comment noted. The 2001 RTP programmatically addresses equity of service. No inequity has been identified.</p> <p>5. A calendar of outreach events can be found on the SCAG website.</p> <p>6. Comment noted. The Blue Line light rail does extend to Long Beach.</p> <p>1. Why can't we have transit system like the London model? Airports connected by rail.</p> <p>In the RTP there are plans to connect airports by light rail and/or high-speed rail.</p>
115. Sylmar Community College Council General Meeting		

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE
NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE
February 21, 2001	<p>2. MTA-not enough bus services in the Valley. Foothill Blvd. needs more services.</p> <p>3. What can be done about the 18-wheel trucks coming from Mexico? It is dangerous driving with them on the freeway.</p>	<p>2. With the implementation of transit corridors there will be an increase in bus service for the Valley. The proposed transit corridors are San Fernando Valley East/West, Van Nuy, Roscoe, and San Fernando Road.</p> <p>3. This is a complex issue which is handled at the Federal level, not by SCAG. It is understood from recent news releases (2/7/01) that a 5-member trade arbitration panel determined the United States violated the North American Free Trade Agreement by barring Mexican trucks from most of its highways. However, it also stated that the United States can require Mexican truckers to meet US safety standards, on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>4. One former elected official said that the people in this area should have the informational survey giving information such as how many cars, trucks, drivers, etc. She doesn't believe Maglev will be approved. She feels that the politics are such that the community will rise up together and all hell will break loose. Solution must be workable.</p> <p>5. Too many people from other counties are using LAX. El Toro should take care of Orange County and other area airports should take care of their own residents. What is being done about making people use their own airports? Suggestion: Higher surcharge for people coming out of area.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>6. Double road from Pasadena to Palmdale. One side at toll road. This would cut down air pollution and raise money.</p> <p>7. Growth pattern too fast, over-growth, doesn't address traffic, surface streets and getting brunt of traffic. Golden State Freeway congested. Slow the growth.</p>	<p>6. Comment noted.</p> <p>7. The challenges of future population and employment growth and their effect on traffic congestion, transportation investment choices, air quality and housing needs are significant long-range planning issues. In response, SCAG has created the Growth Visioning Subcommittee to inform, engage and facilitate consensus on a "Vision" - a strategy for addressing the challenging consequences of anticipated growth in the region. Specifically, this Subcommittee will provide a policy framework for growth forecasts; provide direction on producing alternative urban form scenarios; consider balanced and efficient growth and transportation patterns; and consider other sustainable development and environmental issues.</p>
	<p>8. What happened to the Master Plan of 1972 and 1986?</p> <p>9. Need more lanes on 110 Freeway. Lanes are narrow. Need more carpool lanes on the 101 Freeway.</p>	<p>8. Master Plans more than 5 years old typically need updating.</p> <p>9. Comment noted.</p>
116. Dave Moortchnik 7202 Stonewood Drive Huntington Beach, CA 92647 714/842-8766 <a href="mailto:davenbobbe@mindspring.com">davenbobbe@mindspring.com</a>		<p>1. One of the heavily congested freeways in Orange County is the I-405 between I-22 and Bristol. Yet there is no highway project listed to accomplish a major improvement in this corridor. This is a critical need. I request that an expansion of the I-405 be added to the RTP constrained project list. If funds are short, then one</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>2.</p> <p>Tables 4.3 and 5.2 of the draft RTP indicate baseline and plan route mile additions which add up to 192 miles for urban (light) rail and 964 miles for Metrolink. I have reviewed all the transit project tables and lists in the RTP and its appendices and am able to find only a small fraction on this mileage increase. Together, the rail increases would cost about 21 billion dollars, not something that would be lost in the shuffle.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Either tables 4.3 and 5.2 are in error or the project list tables are incomplete. Please review the inputs to tables 4.3 and 5.2 or add the missing projects to the appropriate project lists. To support understanding, please add route mile addition for each project listed.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>Section "Recommended Highway and Arterial Improvement," page 59 state, "In the absence of a separate task force, the RTP TAC has guided the development of this component of the RTP." As a member of the TAC, I can say that this statement is an exaggeration and not true. The TAC has many topics to review and spent almost no time on this subject. But roads carry more than 95 percent of all transportation and is</p> <p>2-4. Comments noted. See revised appendices contained in the Final RTP.</p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
the most important element of the RTP. A small improvement in road is more significant than doubling all of transit programs. For this reason, the RTP should add the following statement and action plan. A separate task force for highways and arterials is needed to coordinate and optimize future development. This task force will also consider the development of advanced highway technologies.	<p>1-2. Aviation comments noted. SCAG studied several aviation scenarios reflecting different distributions of aviation capacities across the region.</p> <p>2. Remove all freight to other pinpoints. It would be cheaper for the operations. Land is cheaper, office space cheaper and cut down of flights. (Southwest Airlines – instead of every hour, every 2 hours).</p> <p>3. The raising of gas taxes etc. is ludicrous. The pinpoint cannot handle more traffic. It does not address removal of homes (loss of property tax).</p>	<p>1-3. SCAG's proposal to adjust the state fuel tax merely reflects past actions to maintain a certain level of purchasing power.</p> <p>1-3. Opposition to LAX expansion noted.</p> <p>2. Do not allow LAX to expand at all.</p> <p>3.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
119.	Mildred & Charles Heath 216 W. Fairview Blvd. Inglewood, CA 90302	<p>No LAX expansion!!!</p> <p>1. We of the southwest part of Los Angeles County appreciate your work in study and implementation of safer highways and connecting roads.</p> <p>2. We that don't work feel isolated in our homes during peak traffic hours. Those going to work arrive in a tense state, from stop and go traffic.</p> <p>3. I will only travel to Marina del Rey during mid- day, if at all. Trucks use Aviation Blvd., so watch out.</p> <p>4. I beseech you to limit the expansion of Los Angeles Airport to NO EXPANSION. Just improve traffic flow.</p> <p>5. No one seems concerned about the children living under the flight path whose lungs are hindered from fuel development.</p> <p>1-2. Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see listing of aviation scenarios in RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond it's existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland</p>
120.	Carlos and Catherine Garcia 8731 Yorktown Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/216-0788 Phone/Fax	<p>1. That LAX Not be expanded.</p> <p>2. That alternative airport sites to LAX be used, i.e. Ontario.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
121. Gary Schivley Osage Neighborhood Committee 8400 Belford Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/739-5400	<p>1. The expansion of LAX. We do not want this project to ever see daylight. Increasing traffic, pollution and noise for a few more maps is not worth it to this community.</p> <p>2. Correct the existing problems with LAX. Freeway ramps (105) into the airport. Not terminate them on surface streets. This is ludicrous. Why bother installing exits for LAX. Improve local transportation.</p>	<p>1-2. Comments concerning improving ground access to LAX in lieu of airport expansion noted.</p>
122. William Heard 6155 Will Rogers St. Los Angeles, CA 90045	<p>1. Ease traffic on surface streets. Keep LAX traffic off local streets.</p>	<p>1. Comment concerning improving ground access to LAX in lieu of airport expansion noted.</p>
123. Inez Storey Sylmar Coordinating Council 13810 Gladstone Sylmar, CA 91342 818/367-3583	<p>1. Lack of local bus transportation. Bus service to Santa Clarita/Ventura area need for 24-hour metro service. Lower prices.</p> <p>2. Long distance truckers complain that using the right lane is dangerous. Would like to use left lane. Is hard to avoid oncoming ramp traffic.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted. SCAG has proposed, as a goal, to maintain the 1997 per capita ridership level of 34.9 trips per person per year. Due to the fact that the population will almost double by 2025, the transit ridership goal can only be met by increasing services on all tiers of the transit network; which, includes commuter rail, interregional rail, urban rail, express buses, shuttles/circulators, and most importantly, local bus.</p> <p>2. Under the law, truckers are only allowed to use the two outer lanes on any freeway. Ramp conflicts where traffic enters the freeway from the right are one of the reasons that the RTP includes dedicated truck lanes on the SR-60 and I-15, with study of similar lanes on I-710 and I-5. These lanes would have separate access points for trucks, and no cars would be allowed on the truck lanes at all.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
124. Arlene Cameron 7641 Midfield Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 213/649-1318 213/584-6954 Fax Acameron@vcai.com	<p>1. The amount of congestion in Westchester is due to the major developments not only in Westchester but also in surrounding neighborhoods. It appears that there has been no real thought concerning the affect on the environment pollution as well any consideration of the impact on preparing the necessary infrastructure to meet the increased traffic and pollution caused. I understand that everyone is interested in improving himself or herself, but when it is at the cost of others is where find it difficult to understand.</p> <p>2. We are continually confronted with increased pollution and traffic but I have yet to see any major improvement in easing the traffic gridlock. For all the diamond lanes, added lanes to freeways, Metro Rail, there has been no real planned approach to developing an overall plan to service the entire population. We seem to cater to specific areas such as service between San Diego and Downtown LA. While that is one step we have not considered what the Westside needs as well. No one considers the a lot of the traffic congestion that we are experiencing is the direct result of our population moving out of the city and still working in all areas throughout LA. Had we efficient and effective public transportation from all of the outlining areas to all areas of the city not just to Downtown LA we may start to see some reduction.</p>	<p>1. Comments noted.</p> <p>2-3. Comments on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see listing of aviation scenarios in RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond it's existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
		<p>3.</p> <p>I agree with the plan and its exclusion of the LAX Master Plan. I find it appalling that such a plan has been in the planning stages for some three years and there has been no real thought put into what would be good for the entire city not just LAX and LA. As I understand their plan is based solely on the anticipated growth of passenger service and larger capacity planes while excluding any thought of how to best service the region. I find it hard to understand the phrase so often stated that LAX is the third largest international servicer. It appears that their plan is to allow them to compete as if we were in race to be number 1. They say it will bring revenue and jobs, but at what cost. The plan calls for the displacement of many residents, who will most likely find it necessary to move out of the city and commute putting more traffic on the freeways. And what plans are in place for this increase. I also understand that Los Angeles owns two other airports, Palmdale and Ontario. I do know that Ontario has undergone a great deal of upgrading specifically for cargo but could in all likelihood accommodate international passenger services. We also have in our hands several military bases such as El Toro, which could service that southern region quite well. I understand that this has caused a great deal of negative reaction by the residents but they do not realize nor do</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>they care about the impact on others. It would not only provide them relief of the traffic congestion as well as us. I am against any additional growth of LAX and hope that we have more progressive thinking planners who work toward providing equitable, efficient, and effective transportation for all without disrupting the lives of its residents.</p>	<p>1-3. Comments noted. SCAG has undertaken extensive outreach to all communities including those noted by commenter.</p>
125. Alameda Corridor Jobs Coalition (ACIC) Community Dialogue February 12, 2001	<p>1. SCAG needs to do more outreach in South Central Los Angeles, East Los Angeles, Compton and Watts targeting communities with the highest unemployment and poverty rates, with detailed information and maps showing new and/or improved transit will help hinder low-income communities.</p> <p>2. Transportation information and updates need to be thoughtfully distributed to community based organizations within low-income communities.</p> <p>3. Some community-based organizations in low-income communities need to be funded to conduct outreach activities.</p> <p>4. Pedestrian safety was not analyzed or given significant consideration within the draft.</p> <p>5.</p>	<p>4. The actions recommended to facilitate the achievement of the goals of the Non-Motorized Transportation program have been reworded to include pedestrian safety as a priority.</p> <p>5.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>Is pedestrian safety e.g. walkway improvement at the 110 Freeway off ramp, a priority?</p> <p>6. Low income/minority communities are suffering due to poor air quality/emission. Health was a major concern.</p> <p>7. SCAG should oversee MTA's outreach programs.</p>	<p>Safety in general is a priority of the Plan.</p> <p>6. SCAG's analysis of future air emissions impacts in 2025 under the Regional Transportation Plan does not show disproportionate impacts affecting minority or low-income communities.</p> <p>7. Comment noted.</p>
126. Kim Williamson 7617 Dunfield Ave. 310/641-2853 310/333-1350 Fax <a href="mailto:Kim@kimrealty.com">Kim@kimrealty.com</a>	<p>1. Traffic Jams, but most important is the LAX expansion! We oppose expansion. Too much pollution and cars!</p> <p>2. It addresses more the need to increase transportation; and not the quality of life; homeownership and local neighborhoods that have been in place for 50 years!</p>	<p>1, 2. Comments noted.</p>
127. Sandra Bray 8712 Yorktown Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045	<p>1. Most important concerns are LAX Master Plan Land acquisition; No more homes, retain present boundaries; no outside expansion.</p> <p>2. Please vote to contain LAX, no land expansion.</p>	<p>1, 2. Comments noted.</p>
128. Eugene R. Kochleon 8701 W. 79 <sup>th</sup> Street	<p>1. Don't make LAX any larger. It won't work</p>	<p>1, 2, 3. Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
641-5737	<p>any better when larger but going to it will be tougher and the end result will be criticized as inconvenient and hectic anyway.</p> <p>2. Enlarge other (smaller) regional airports. Travelers will ultimately go where they have to.</p> <p>3. Regional is what we all want. All peoples should shoulder the burden of our progress, not just one airport (LAX).</p>	<p>aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p>
129.	<p>Joyce Keohler 5701 W. 79<sup>th</sup> St. Westchester, CA 90045 310/641-5737 <a href="mailto:genenjoycek@aol.com">genenjoycek@aol.com</a></p>	<p>1. Halt LAX expansion with it increased access roads, rim routes, etc. Better is a regional approach as the greater Los Angeles area grows. We need other airports to service freight and passengers.</p> <p>2. Need to address regional approach.</p> <p>3. It seems to be the most reasonable approach. It is necessary for air quality and sound quality and safety (larger planes larger accidents.)</p>
130.	<p>Stacy Young 8212 Handley Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90044</p>	<p>1. Opposition to LAX expansion noted.</p> <p>2.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
131. Roger May 7406 El Manor Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045	Documentation of airline traffic, passenger and cargo, to outlying facilities.	1, 2. Opposition to LAX expansion noted.
132. Judy May 7406 El Manor Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 Emba7406@aol.com	1. The airport expansion at LAX most important concern.  2. Freeze the airport size.  2. Limit LAX to 78 MM (Max)	1, 2. Opposition to LAX expansion noted.
133. James & Sheri Gay 2712 Toland Ave. 310/649-6313	1. Over expansion of LAX, too many planes in the sky at one time.  2. Expand out to El Toro, Burbank if LA airports claimed eminent domain here, why not in Burbank?	1, 2. Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.
134. Robert Young June Satton 7512 Midfield Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/559-0412 <a href="mailto:Ryoung7512@aol.com">Ryoung7512@aol.com</a>	1. The already existing congestion! Why bring more volume into this area? Why are you proposing it's ok to expand on area, when other areas are successfully fighting the same expand?	1, 2, 3, 4. Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>405 to LAX than to drive to Palmdale. We must divide this congestion to Ontario, Orange County etc. We must.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Taking our land and homes isn't going to remedy the congestion unless we move it out of the area! Move it to Ontario to share the burden. There's plenty of land. We don't have the land here!</p> <p>4.</p> <p>They put a factory outlet mall in Ontario and people are going. If they move some of the air traffic out to Ontario, people will go where they have to even Palmdale.</p>	<p>1, 2.</p> <p>Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p>
135.  Isabel Fernandez 8219 Barnsley Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/216-0789 213/748-7475 <a href="mailto:Ichavela@aol.com">Ichavela@aol.com</a>	<p>1.</p> <p>Traffic congestion around LAX most important concern.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Move expansion of airport to Ontario, Palmdale and cargo to other outlying airports.</p>	<p>1, 2.</p> <p>Opposition to LAX expansion noted.</p>
136.  Mary and Michael Cusack 8107 Reading Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045	<p>1.</p> <p>Additional cars on local streets.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Curb airport expansion (LAX).</p> <p>3.</p> <p>We do not have enough information on the plan, to make any comments.</p>	<p>1, 2.</p> <p>Opposition to LAX expansion noted.</p>
137.  John Riley	1.	1, 2, 3.

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
7518 Midfield Los Angeles, CA 90045	<p>LAX is big enough already without adding more runway access. The 405 is a parking lot now. Access in or out will only add more traffic to 405.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Diversify your airports, Palmdale, Ontario El Toro etc.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Leave LAX the way it is or make it smaller and 75 percent plus passengers not freight.</p>	<p>Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p>
138. Stacy Uchiyama 8840 Croydon Ave. Westchester, CA 90045 310/337-7151	<p>1. Save our community!</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Questions not answered about our homes.</p>	<p>1, 2. Comments noted.</p>
139. Roger Hill Osage Neighborhood Association 7406 Midfield Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/641-1609 <a href="mailto:Rhil059@aol.com">Rhil059@aol.com</a>		<p>1, 2, 3.</p> <p>Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Accept airport plan on some issues that help with traffic but do not accept any change inside airport that would increase flights.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Do things to encourage flights to other airports.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
140. Anton Acherman 6055 W. 75 <sup>th</sup> Place 310/645-2528	<p>1. Too many cars; limited ground transportation. We need high-speed rail transportation. Parking shortage; people park now at hotels around LAX.</p> <p>2. Regional transportation solution; spread the traffic out. Do not concentrate all at one location (LAX).</p> <p>3. You go into the right direction.</p>	<p>1, 2, 3.</p> <p>Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p>
141. D.C. Parsons 6305 W. 77 <sup>th</sup> Place Los Angeles, CA 90045	<p>1. Expansion of LAX most important concern.</p> <p>2. Go to Ontario; move cargo from LAX.</p>	<p>1, 2.</p> <p>Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p>
142. Peggy Mellody Osage Home Owners Association 7712 Hindry Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/823-9809 310/645-0811 Fax <a href="mailto:Peggy@osaweb.com">Peggy@osaweb.com</a>	<p>1. LAX expansion most important concern.</p> <p>Expansion should be prevented at LAX by focusing on regional solutions. LAX should only use existing facilities.</p> <p>2. Divert increased in annual air cargo to regional airports (i.e. Ontario Orange County, Palmdale El Toro).</p> <p>3. I like the ideas for high-speed trains, truck</p>	<p>1, 2.</p> <p>Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Comments in support of high speed rail, truck lanes and toll lanes</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	lanes, and toll lanes.	are noted. Truck lanes are included in the RTP in order to reduce peak hour delay and unsafe traffic conditions relating to the interweaving of trucks and automobiles; to handle the growing numbers of trucks; to improve truck throughput; and to ensure continued vitality of goods movement, by moving freight with less congestion and delay.
143.  Jeanne Young Osage Homeowners Association 8100 Handley Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/568-8839 310/215-9865	<p>1. I want to stop any LAX expansion.</p> <p>2. Expand airports in the growing areas of California i.e., Palmdale, Ontario, Orange County. Use El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p> <p>3. I like the idea of using military bases. Also using high-speed rail is a good idea. It would cut down on people driving between large cities i.e., Los Angeles to San Diego. It works in the East Coast. People use trains.</p>	<p>1, 2, 3. Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p>
144.  Fred Krinbell 7807 Toland Los Angeles, CA 90045	<p>1. Air plane noise most important concern.</p> <p>2. Stop Expansion</p> <p>3. Comments on RTP: Stop</p>	<p>1, 2, 3. Opposition to LAX expansion noted.</p>
145.  Mary Jean Baca 8140 Barnsley Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/337-7067 <a href="mailto:davidg@vimet.com">davidg@vimet.com</a>		<p>1, 2, 3. Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p> <p>1. LAX expansion most important transportation concern.</p> <p>2. Increase loads handled by other regional airports besides LAX.</p> <p>3. Looks good as long as passenger loads at LAX are not expanded beyond 78 million.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS RTP	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
146. Sheila Garcia Osage Neighbors Association 8213 Reading Ave. 310/337-0370 <a href="mailto:Sheilagarc@aol.com">Sheilagarc@aol.com</a>	1. The proposed expansion of LAX most important transportation concern. 2. Oppose the LAX expansion plan.	1, 2. Opposition to LAX expansion noted.
147. Adelina Ghilardi 5416 W. 82 <sup>nd</sup> Street 310/649-6282 <a href="mailto:AIMGHLIA@pacbell.net">AIMGHLIA@pacbell.net</a>	1. LAX expansion; traffic and pollution to the Westchester area; noise most important transportation concern. 2. Stop LAX expansion and stop expressway expansion. Stop access road. Save our historic Centinela Adobe.	1, 2. Opposition to LAX expansion and related noise noted.
148. Frank Vassallo 7756 Toland Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045	1. LAX expansion impacts on local neighborhoods increased transportation/traffic most important transportation concern. 2. More freight traffic out the area. Say “NO” to anymore expansion at LAX and focus on outer areas. 3. Say “no” to LAX expansion.	1, 2, 3. Opposition to LAX expansion noted.
149. Linda Thorsen Osage Neighborhood Association 7762 Tsis Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/338-8706	1. My concern is the possible physical infringement upon local homes increasing already in tolerable noise levels and pollution. By easing transportation routes to LAX it only invites more passengers to our neighborhood. 2. Use Century Freeway corridor for east-west connections and let the airports south of us handle their own airport traffic. With the	Opposition to LAX expansion and related noise/traffic noted. Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	Playa Vista development, we are going to be inundated as it is. 3. Send high-speed rail out to Palmdale or El Toro. Use incentive to lure airlines out there. Increase landing taxes at LAX! I do not want to see airbuses landing here with their 550-600 passenger capacity. City killer is right. Send them to larger less populated airfields How scary.	1, 2. Opposition to LAX expansion noted.
150. Toni Fred 7770 Toland Ave. 310/649-3067 <a href="mailto:fourwolfs@aol.com">fourwolfs@aol.com</a>	1. Too many planes. Expansion of LAX most important transportation concerns. 2. No LAX expansion!	1, 2. Opposition to LAX expansion noted.
151. Tim Carbajal 7919 Kittyhawk Ave. Westchester, CA 90045 310/348-9775	1. Our homes taken away most important transportation concern. 2. Move all cargo to other airports.	1, 2, 3. Opposition to LAX expansion impacts on neighborhood noted.
152. Dennis Lang 7862 Midfield Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/645-9183	1. Losing my home to airport expansion most important transportation concern. 2. How long do we go before we can get on with our future? Hanging in limbo stinks. 3. It sounds like RTP and SCAG is preparing us for a move.	1, 2, 3. Opposition to LAX expansion impacts on neighborhood noted.
153. Daisy A. Wijesuriya 8730 Yorktown Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045	1. The noise from the airplanes most important transportation concern. On rainy and stormy days, weather the planes do not	1. Opposition to LAX noise impacts noted.

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>take off over the ocean, but go over my house, which scares us very much with lot of vibrating noise.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Presently I do not know whether my house will be soundproofed. I am not in favor of the expansion or the airport at all.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>I do not like the high-speed transportation that they are proposing to introduce.</p>	<p>2, 3.</p> <p>Comment noted</p>
154. WM O'Neal 8871 Hiley Post Ave. Los Angeles	<p>1. Pollution; excess traffic at Lax area now most important transportation concern.</p> <p>2. Bullet trains between Los Angeles and San Francisco with branch to Palmdale Airport etc.</p>	<p>1. Opposition to LAX traffic impacts on local neighborhood noted.</p> <p>2. Inter-city and intra-regional high-speed systems are currently under study.</p>
155. Sean Lonegan 7522 Midfield Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/649-2397	<p>1. LAX expansion most important transportation concern.</p>	<p>1. LAX expansion concern noted.</p>
156. Cynthia Chaney 7522 Midfield Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/568-8300 <a href="mailto:Tennis5982@aol.com">Tennis5982@aol.com</a>	<p>1. LAX expansion most important transportation concern.</p>	<p>1. LAX expansion concern noted.</p>
157. Nancy Hall and Ruth Hall Osage Neighbors 7913 Breen Ave.		<p>1, 2, 3.</p> <p>Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	Expand regional airports. This will decrease long commutes to LAX. 3. Please don't let this "plan" take more homes away. Enough! We live here. Don't pave paradise and put up a parking lot!	incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.
158.  Sheri Allen 7741 Goddard Westchester <a href="mailto:Sallen848@juno.com">Sallen848@juno.com</a>	1. No expansion of LAX; no local expressway. Transportation (MagLev) to other areas outside residential areas.	1. Opposition to LAX expansion noted.
159.  Cheri	Impact on Westchester's community.	1. Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.  2. Have other areas connect with the airports around Southern California not just LAX.  3. Think it's too expensive. Our taxes should be spent differently.
160.  Fred W. Wolf 7770 Toland Ave.	1. Expanding the LAX is the only concern.	1, 2, 3. Comment on alternatives to LAX expansion noted. Please see the

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
310/649-3067 <a href="mailto:Fourwolfs@aol.com">Fourwolfs@aol.com</a>	<p>Why spend the money, especially on more transportation. Take it elsewhere.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Take the expansion plans to somewhere else. (Palmdale, Logistics, El Toro)</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Regional transportation plan is just enabling LAX to go ahead with the expansion plan.</p>	<p>aviation scenarios analyzed in the RTP. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p>
161.  Rose M. Pohl Osage Neighbor Association 76123 Midfield Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045  <a href="mailto:rpol@omm.com">rpol@omm.com</a>	<p>1.</p> <p>Access to my home as it is today without an expressway is my most important transportation concern.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Do not expand LAX, by not increasing the number of freights to and from LAX then need for expansion and increased needs would be eliminated.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>An expressway would increase the traffic in and around Westchester resulting in congestion and reduce property value.</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>Opposition to LAX expansion noted.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Impacts associated with development of a commercial airport at El Toro are programmatically evaluated in the 2001 RTP PEIR. A Master Plan EIR has also been prepared for El Toro by Orange</p>
162.  Osage Neighborhood Association Community Dialogue March 5, 2001	<p>1.</p> <p>How is the RTP going to protect homes near the airport?</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>SCAG has no authority over local airport development. The RTP offers regional aviation scenarios to allow decision-makers the opportunity to review impacts of various alternatives and affords the opportunity for regional consensus on planning for all modes of transportation as part of the RTP PEIR, SCAG looked at regional impacts from various aviation scenarios.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>How is the recommendation not going to adversely impact the El Toro community as it did to the LAX?</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>3. Why is LAX being capitalized?</p> <p>4. What does LAX do when they take our homes?</p> <p>5. Is SCAG backing the LAX Masterplan?</p> <p>6. Can SCAG assure the residents that not additional houses will be taken away?</p> <p>7. Why does SCAG concentrate on LAX and not other airports such as Palmdale, March AFB etc.?</p> <p>8. Why the airports are not outside the cities like those in Europe and Japan? People will go to where the airports are.</p> <p>9.</p>	<p>County.</p> <p>LAX is capitalized through user fees, rents and various other revenue generating devices. Please contact the LAWA public relations office for more detailed information</p> <p>Airport buyout of homes is regulated through Federal Aviation Regulations.</p> <p>SCAG is reviewing the LAX Master Plan/EIR and has not yet taken an official position. However, the currently recommended aviation component of the RTP (Scenario 8) does not include the LAX Master Plan.</p> <p>Airport buyout of homes are regulated through Federal Aviation Regulations.</p> <p>SCAG has analyzed numerous aviation scenarios that include and exclude LAX expansion, El Toro development and market incentives to Palmdale and Inland Empire airports in order to decentralize aviation demand throughout the region. Four scenarios were forwarded for environmental evaluation as part of the RTP Environmental analysis. Please see listing of aviation scenarios in RTP.</p> <p>SCAG has no authority to close urban airports.</p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>Can we move the cargo somewhere else?</p> <p>10. Will the new 300 Airbus and new 747 planes bring in more passengers, thus increase ground traffic?</p> <p>11. The RTP is good but the excise tax burden will disproportionately fall onto certain communities.</p> <p>12. Where are the expressways going to be built?</p> <p>13. I am not satisfied with the traffic conditions on the 405 Freeway, how can we get better transportation without having homes taken away?</p>	<p>Inland Empire airports are promoting themselves as cargo airports.</p> <p>10. The new Airbus and 747 may or may not have an impact, depending on aircraft turnaround time at the terminal gates.</p> <p>11. Comment noted.</p> <p>12. Road improvements are identified in the Strategic Investments section of the RTP.</p> <p>13. Comment noted. The actual construction activity that will occur on any given project is determined on a project-by-project basis and not in the RTP.</p> <p>1, 2. Concern about LAX expansion on minority and low-income neighborhoods is noted. SCAG has looked at environmental justice as part of the RTP.</p>
163. Michele Levin 8425 Ramsgate Ave. Westchester, CA 90045 310/474-6584 ext. 330 310/474-6517 Fax <a href="mailto:Melvin@lausd.k12.ca.us">Melvin@lausd.k12.ca.us</a>	<p>1. LAX expansion (including moving and extending runways), proposed ring Road and arteries through Westchester and Inglewood, increased 405 traffic.</p> <p>2. Environmental Justice- notice, traffic can't combine to fall on the same neighborhoods. Don't assume that "mitigating" intersections that are currently D F ratings and over 100 percent capacity doesn't mean the death of those surrounding neighborhoods.</p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	3. Follow the SCAG recommendation to keep the Los Angeles Airport in no growth status, no runway expansion, no ring road, 78 MAP. Conduct analysis only.	3. The currently recommended aviation scenario will minimize both traffic and noise impacts to the Westchester community by limiting LAX to its current infrastructure.
164.  Janice Holt 7637 Goddard Los Angeles, CA 90045  649-5586  <a href="mailto:Joyce@brianandGina.com">Joyce@brianandGina.com</a>	1. No comment	
165.  Robert Trovsdale 321 Fowling Street Playa del Rey, CA 310/306-0073 310/806-1309 Fax  <a href="mailto:R.Trovsdale@gte.net">R.Trovsdale@gte.net</a>	1. Airport expansion requiring roadways impeding neighborhoods and reducing property values.  2. Regional approach to airport expanding in existing neighborhoods is poor planning.  3. No, no, no – We need light rail to Palmdale, Ontario, Orange County Airports.	1, 2, 3. Concern over airport impacts on property values and surface transportation system is noted.
166.  Shirley McCracken City of Anaheim 200 S. Anaheim Blvd. Anaheim, CA 92805 714/765-5247 714/765-5164 Fax	1. Huge increase of 18 wheelers on freeways through Anaheim and impact. Increase of freight trains (currently 50/day soon to be 90/day) and grade crossing and environmental impact.	1. Some of the truck movements impacting Anaheim may result from trucks including marine containers moving over the 91 Freeway to the 57 Freeway and north towards the Inland Empire. The plan will provide an alternative route via the SR-60 truck lanes. Also, with regard to truck traffic that has to move through this part of Orange County, the plan includes auxiliary lane improvements on SR-91 and SR-57, widening of I-5 just west of Anaheim, and extension of toll lanes along SR-91 east of Orange County, which would provide additional freeway capacity through this part of Orange County.  Regarding the rail traffic increase, the plan includes a significant railroad grade crossing improvement including grade separations, along the Orangethorpe Corridor.

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
167. Sandra Bray 8712 Yorktown Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045	<p>2. Bring goods to south county through El Toro, reducing freight traffic.</p> <p>3. Need more time to evaluate RTP.</p> <p>1. Thank you for attending the March 5, Osage-Westchester Neighbors Association meeting and for your presentation. Also, thank you for the transportation committee's vote to not include the expansion of LAX in the Regional Transportation Plan.</p> <p>2. I strongly urge your Regional Council to follow the committee's vote and not to include the LAX expansion in the Regional Transportation Plan.</p> <p>3. This environmental, health, and safety travesty proposed by LAX on its neighbors must be stopped now! Never again should LAX be allowed outside expansion of their present boundaries! Palmdale and other airports must be utilized.</p>	<p>1, 3. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted. The currently recommended regional aviation scenario (designated 8) does not include the LAX Master Plan.</p> <p>1, 2, 3.</p>
168. Rosa Lopez IVAG 940 Main Street, Suite 208 El Centro, CA 92243 (760) 352-7876 Fax ivag@imperialcounty.net		<p>Included herein are question and concerns pertaining to the above mentioned document expressed by the Imperial Valley Association of Governments. It is important that SCAG respond to these issues.</p> <p>1.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>p. 135, Table 7.7 – The table displays no information on congestion delay for Imperial County, “Data for Imperial County not yet available.” Where should the data come from? Should the question be stated differently? Does this question have a relationship to Exhibit 5.4, p. 58?</p> <p>2. P. 135, Table 7.7 – The table displays no information on 2025 Projected Ethnicity by County. “Data for Imperial County not yet available.” Where should the data come from?</p> <p>3. P. 136, Table 7.9 – The table displays no information of Comparisons of Emissions. “Data for Imperial County not yet available.” Where should the data come from?</p>	<p>Congestion relief, demographic, and air quality data for the SCAG region counties come from SCAG’s models and forecasting processes. At the time of release of the Draft Regional Transportation Plan, these data were not yet completed for Imperial County. The data for Imperial County have been incorporated into the final environmental justice analysis for the plan.</p>
169.	Margo Fletcher <a href="mailto:Fletmj1@aol.com">Fletmj1@aol.com</a>	<p>1. My concern is whether the Regional Council of SCAG will vote next month to include an expansion of LAX in its Regional Transportation Plan. I am opposed to such a vote, as I feel that the LAX area already has serious traffic pollution and noise problems that will only worsen if there is an expansion of LAX. I feel that nearby airport should share the burden of accommodating the increase of air traffic.</p>
170.	Patrick Sullivan Osage Neighbors	<p>1, 2. Opposition to LAX expansion is noted. Please see listing of aviation</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Association  7840 McConnell Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/670-9076 310/670-9076 Fax <a href="mailto:sullivanpst@mindspring.com">sullivanpst@mindspring.com</a>	<p>would like to record my opposition to any expansion of LAX. It is already an environmental hazard. If it gets any bigger it will turn the 405 Freeway into a permanent traffic jam. Just travel the freeway during the early afternoon hours any one of the seven days of the week. It is almost impassable. Is that what we want through the Westside? My family and I do not. We will be forced to move if this goes forward. Expand the airports in the surrounding areas to include Palmdale.</p> <p>2. Continue to oppose any expansion of LAX.</p>	<p>scenarios in RTP.</p> <p>1. In the RTP there are plans to connect airports by light rail and/or high-speed rail. SCAG has looked at a high-speed rail system using magnetic levitation technology linking airports as part of the RTP process.</p> <p>2. With the implementation of transit corridors there will be an increase in bus service for the Valley. The proposed transit corridors are San Fernando Valley East/West, Van Nuys, Roscoe, and San Fernando Road.</p> <p>3. What can be done about the 18-wheel trucks coming from Mexico. It is dangerous driving with them on the freeway.</p> <p>4. One former elected official said that the people in this area should have the</p>
171.  Sylmar Community Coordinating Council February 21, 2001		

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>informational survey giving information such as how many cars, truck, drivers etc. She doesn't believe Maglev will be approved. She feels that the politics are such that the community will rise up together and all hell will break loose. Solution must be workable.</p> <p>5. Too many people from other countries are using LAX. El Toro should take care of Orange County, and other area airports should take care of their own residents. What is being done about making people use their own airports? Suggest higher surcharge for people coming out of area.</p> <p>6. Double road from Pasadena to Palmdale. One side at toll road. This would cut down air pollution and raise money.</p> <p>7. Growth pattern too fast, over-growth, doesn't address traffic. Surface streets are getting brunt of traffic. Golden State Freeway congestion. Slow the growth.</p> <p>8. What happened to the Master Plan of 1972 and 1986?</p> <p>9. Need more lanes on 110 Freeway. Lanes are narrow. Need more carpool lanes on the 101 Freeway.</p>	<p>One of SCAG's guiding principles for aviation is that all counties have the opportunity and obligation to meet their own air traffic needs where feasible.</p> <p>6, 7. Comment noted</p> <p>9. Comment noted.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
172.  Gunnar Nelson 8016 Ramsgate Ave. 310/215-0241	<p>1.</p> <p>I am opposed to the building of a ring road around Los Angeles International Airport. It will damage too many homes' property values.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Develop the Palmdale Airport and other regional airports such as Ontario and El Toro. The people of Westchester are being asked to give up too much.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>The Regional Transportation Plan places too much emphasis on expanding LAX and not enough effort in developing a regional airport plan through the use of all the region's airports.</p>	<p>1, 2, 3.</p> <p>Opposition to LAX expansion is noted. Please see listing of aviation scenarios in RTP. SCAG has looked at numerous ways of decentralizing aviation facilities and demand throughout the region. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p>
173.  Walter Hoffman 7831 Henefer Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045	<p>1.</p> <p>Airport and freeway gridlock most important transportation concern.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Limit airport growth. Reduce truck traffic. Reduce truck size.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Too little, too late on RTP</p>	<p>1, 2.</p> <p>Please see listing of aviation scenarios in RTP. SCAG has looked at numerous ways of decentralizing aviation facilities and demand throughout the region.. Various scenarios examined whether or not to develop LAX beyond its existing physical capacity, whether or not to develop El Toro as a commercial service airport and the use of high speed rail linkages (along with market incentives) to stimulate demand (and service) at Palmdale and Inland Empire airports.</p> <p>Reducing truck size may, however, mean more trucks will have to be on the road to carry the same volume of freight.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
174.  Community Dialogue Asian Pacific Policy and	<p>1.</p> <p>How critical is the air quality compliance?</p>	<p>1,2,5,6,7.</p> <p>These specific comments and questions were addressed directly by</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
<p>Planning Council February 22, 2001</p> <p>What transportation projects will not be implemented if we lose federal funding?</p> <p>2. Where is the airport noise going to occur? Has SCAG analyzed the design of runways, etc.?</p> <p>3. Did SCAG look at the impact coming from increasing transportation accessibility to jobs in its EJ analysis?</p> <p>4. Will SCAG take a more proactive approach in creating land use through transportation choices?</p> <p>5. Does the EJ analysis take into consideration health-related impact on specific regions?</p> <p>6. Is there an analysis on whether or not low-income communities will bear a</p>	<p>SCAG staff in the presentation to this group.</p> <p>SCAG has looked at basic noise impacts. However, official noise contours meeting the criteria required by Federal Aviation Regulations Part 150 and the State of California are done by the individual airports. SCAG does not analyze runway design, as that is part of the extensive master planning process and environmental evaluation done as part of an airport master plan.</p> <p>The challenges of future population and employment growth and their effect on traffic congestion, transportation investment choices, air quality and housing needs are significant long-range planning issues. In response, SCAG has created the Growth Visioning Subcommittee to inform, engage and facilitate consensus on a "Vision" - a strategy for addressing the challenging consequences of anticipated growth in the region. Specifically, this Subcommittee will provide a policy framework for growth forecasts; provide direction on producing alternative urban form scenarios; consider balanced and efficient growth and transportation patterns; and consider other sustainable development and environmental issues.</p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS disproportional transportation tax burden?	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>7. Has SCAG looked into the mobility and transit need of seniors in the San Fernando Valley?</p> <p>8. How much trucking is going to be taken away from the freeway upon the completion of Alameda Corridor and Alameda Corridor East?</p>	<p>8. The Alameda Corridor is primarily a mitigation measure to reduce the impacts of existing port-related train traffic and future train traffic growth on arterial highways and residential communities between the San Pedro Bay Ports and downtown rail yards. The major increases in diversion from highway to train will occur as a result of more on-dock loading of marine containers, as planned by the Ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach, and increased use of the efficient near-dock facility at the ICTF in Carson, which requires only a short dray over the uncongested Terminal Island Freeway. These facilities will allow truck traffic to be taken off the freeways, with a rail haul substituted between the ports and downtown LA.</p> <p>The Alameda Corridor East will result in an increased reliability of service over the course of a year, which may help divert some truck traffic to rail. The numbers would be difficult to quantify.</p>
175.	Odalis Suarez	<p>9. Is there any analysis on short haul vs. long haul truck trips?</p> <p>.</p> <p>1.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Oakmost Woods P.O. Box 477 Verdugo City, CA 91046 818/541-1349 818/240-3157 Fax	<p>Spending a large portion of my life in traffic. Truck vs. car; people not following rules of road.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Need stricter standards for obtaining licenses. Courthouses downtown should be instructed to perform more court appearances by phone or written declaration such as status conferences.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Progress of transportation too slow.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Potential conflicts between trucks and cars are one reason why truck lanes are included in the RTP. The intent is to reduce peak hour delay and unsafe traffic conditions relating to the interweaving of trucks and automobiles and to handle the growing numbers of trucks.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Comments noted. The enforcement of traffic laws is carried out by local authorities, not by SCAG or the RTP.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>1, 2, 3.</p> <p>Comments noted. Signage and information for travelers is generally under the authority of local governments.</p>
176. Julianne Spillman 1001 E. California 818/662-0412 <a href="mailto:juliford@webtv.net">juliford@webtv.net</a>		<p>1.</p> <p>Directions and names – many signs give BlaBla E., BlaBla W., BlaBla D., BlaBla B. but no name of where they take you. BlaBla 101 – 5 – 10 – 145 etc.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Hang name of streets in middle of streets. Street signs are neither visible at night nor day because trees etc. interfere.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Simplify transit directions for less confusion.</p> <p>1.</p> <p>The freeways are too crowded. The trains are too expensive. If we add 40 percent more people, life will be different for those that have to commute.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>This is the problem; too many people.</p>
177. Lily Poddick Glenoaks Canyon Homeowners Association 2441 E. Glenoaks Blvd. Glendale, CA 91206 818/242-2787		<p>1, 2.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>3.</p> <p>I think you should concentrate on a 10-year plan. Twenty years is too far in the future, especially with our earthquakes.</p>	<p>3.</p> <p>Federal planning regulations require SCAG to produce an RTP with a time horizon of at least 20 years.</p>
178.	<p>Nancy Burnet Kent 1121 Raleigh St. Glendale, CA 91205 818/242-4320 <a href="mailto:burnetkent@compuserve.com">burnetkent@compuserve.com</a></p> <p><a href="#">[link]</a></p>	<p>1.</p> <p>Although SCAG does not have control over the type of cars being manufactured, there are laws in place that require the production of alternatively fueled automobiles. SCAG is forecasting an increase in these types of automobiles in the future. The RTP has a strong focus on creating a mass transit system by 2025. This includes modes that will be using alternative fuels.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Comments in attached letter noted.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>See attached letter 178a.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Subsidize alternative fuel, don't tax it!</p> <p>3.</p> <p>SCAG simply recognizes that a heavy market penetration of alternative fuel vehicles would require reconsidering the current practice of providing tax incentives for alternative fuel vehicles. As alternative fuel vehicles become more prevalent on the roads, costs for road repair would need to be shared. Cost allocation should be proportional to use. SCAG recognizes that further study is required to assess market penetration and in turn, taxing alternatives. Consequently, SCAG is pursuing state budget augmentation for such a study.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>Comments noted. The Draft RTP document is posted on SCAG's website.</p>
179.	<p>John Bauch Montecito Park Homeowners <a href="mailto:JMBglen@aol.com">JMBglen@aol.com</a></p>	<p>1.</p> <p>One inconsistency in the presentation was a new tax on alternative fuel seems like a disincentive. I thought alternate fuels would</p> <p>1.</p> <p>SCAG simply recognizes that a heavy market penetration of alternative fuel vehicles would require reconsidering the current practice of providing tax incentives for alternative fuel vehicles. As</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	help us meet long-term EPA requirements.	alternative fuel vehicles become more prevalent on the roads, costs for road repair would need to be shared. Cost allocation should be proportional to use. SCAG recognizes that further study is required to assess market penetration and in turn, taxing alternatives. Consequently, SCAG is pursuing state budget augmentation for such a study.
	2. Who decided priorities if we don't meet the budget needs.	2. The process of developing the RTP is a collaborative, bottom-up planning process that involves sub-regional and local input from the beginning to the end. Task forces and committees composed of elected officials, county and sub-regional agencies, and others have for the past few years been working on key issues of the plan, including finance, growth, and transit.
180.	Craig Curtis  Chevy Chase Estates Association 1534 Belleau Road. Glendale, CA 91206	1, 2, 3.  Comments noted.
181.	Frank Dimitro  Alliance for Education 1314 W. Glenoaks Blvd., #200 Glendale, CA 91206 818/244-3135	1. Light rail and bus ways in Southern California.  2. Build more light rail.
182.	Helen Van de Water  Peninsula Seniors 2062 Mt. Shasta Dr. Los Angeles, CA 90732.	1. Public transportation from Rancho Palos Verdes exists today by way of Torrance Transit, the Orange County Transit Authority, and/or MTA.

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
183. S. Herrington Peninsula Seniors 531 Via Almar Palos Verdes Estates  310/831-5179	1. Where to get information/schedule on bus or rail transport.	1. Schedules for bus and rail transport can be obtained by calling or writing the appropriate transit authority. In addition, many transit operators have web pages with their routes and schedules posted.
184. Community Dialogue Dana Strand Housing Project February 20, 2001	1. Need to be cultural sensitivity among transit operators.	1. SCAG believes that transit should be accessible to all customers without major obstacles (physical, institutional, or informational). SCAG would encourage sensitivity training to enhance drivers' awareness of different cultures as well as the needs of elderly and disabled.
185. Dionisia Rivas CBE 1011 Cwalk Apt. #7 Wilmington, CA 90744 310/518-1645	1. My most important concern is that all the transportation representatives educate all the drivers.  2. That motorists do not take their personal problems to the workplace. Three years ago, I received discrimination on the public buses from some African-Americans.	1. Please see reply to comment 184.  2. Many transit operators and have started programs to help ensure transit riders' safety.
186. Esperanza Simental Homeowners Association 3441 Siskyou St. Los Angeles, CA 90023 323/268-7021	1. Light rail transportation most important transportation concern.	1. Please see response to comment 181.
187. Arturo Herrera Boyle Heights Resident Homeowners Association 3438 Lee Street 323/268-4545	1. We still want the Metro as promised to our community.  2. Give us the same as other communities get?	1. The Eastside Light rail is currently under construction it will run from Union Station to Beverly/Atlantic via Lorena/Beverly Blvd.  2. SCAG is dedicated to meeting the transit needs of all people in the

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
188.  Pierre J. Hormann 8701 Wiley Post Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/568-9045 310/568-9045 Fax <a href="mailto:AENT78@aol.com">AENT78@aol.com</a>	<p>1. The additional traffic in front of my house, if the airport expansion does not take my property.</p> <p>2. There are no transportation issues if LAX is not allowed to proceed in their plans.</p> <p>3. Sounds like noting is clear – everything is still going to amount to LAX expansion at the price of homeowners.</p>	<p>SCAG region. To help ensure this the RTP has performance objectives, including the equitable distribution of benefits among all ethnic, age, and income groups and the equitable distribution of benefits (geographically).</p> <p>1-3. Comments noted. The currently recommended regional aviation scenario (designated 8) does not include the LAX Master Plan.</p>
189.  Corky Larson CVAG 73710 Fred Waring Dr. Palm Desert, CA 92260 760/346-1127 760/340-5949 Fax		<p>1. Infrastructure most important transportation concern.</p> <p>2. Renew transportation sales tax.</p> <p>1, 2. Comment noted. SCAG recognizes the importance of continuing local option sales taxes to support many significant transportation projects.</p>
190.  Juan M. De Lara City of Coachella 1515 6 <sup>th</sup> St. Coachella, CA 92236 760/398-3502 760/398-8117 Fax <a href="mailto:JuanDLara@aol.com">JuanDLara@aol.com</a>		<p>1. Interchanges at Expressway 86 for Avenues 50, 52, 54 and 56. Railroad grade separations at Avenue 48/Dillon, Avenue 50, 52, 54, 56. State releasing jurisdiction of Highways 11 and 86</p> <p>2. Extension of Measure A. More developer participation.</p> <p>2. Comments noted. SCAG recognizes the importance of continuing local option sales taxes to support many significant transportation</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>3.</p> <p>Good cooperation between cities especially in the Coachella Valley and Blythe. It will need to keep pace with development.</p>	<p>projects. SCAG will continue to study other available options for funding transportation projects in the region.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
191.  Ray Grossclaude	<p>1.</p> <p>Funding and ability to expand and sustain.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Regional transportation and resource center. New formula showing diversity in funding based on population.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>Complicated and somewhat unrealistic based on future growth and areas that offer no controls, such as highway usage growth next 25 years.</p>	<p>1, 2.</p> <p>Comment noted. Despite population and in turn, economic growth in the region, SCAG recognizes that funds for transportation projects are limited. In fact, it is likely that this trend will continue unless the region begins to rethink financing efforts.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>The Growth Visioning Subcommittee has been established to deal with growth issues.</p>
192.  Karen Thomas	<p>1.</p> <p>Keeping buses on the road in good working order. Having enough buses and other forms of public transportation. Clean burning fuel.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Concentrate more on getting more folks out of their cars and into public transportation.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>I believe that the plan is great and very needed. California needs a bigger, faster public transit system connecting cities and airports.</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>The region is committed through the State Implementation Program to achieving a bus fleet with a minimum of 70% clean fuel buses by 2010.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>Please see reply given to comment #83, items 8, 9, 10.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>The plan's goal is to achieve an efficient system that connects all individuals to major destinations such as airports.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
193. Richard Cromwell III Sunline Transit Agency 32-505 Harry Oliver Trail Thousand Palms, CA 92276 760/343-3456 x 100 760/343-3097 Fax <a href="mailto:rceng@aol.com">rceng@aol.com</a>	1. Transit funding to meeting our area's needs. The current formula has negative impact on our area.	1. SCAG recognizes the need for more transportation funds in order to serve the region's growing population. The 2001 RTP proposes strategies to address this need.
194. Bill Clapper Sunline Services Group 32505 Harry Oliver Trail Thousand Palms, CA 92276 760/343-3456 <a href="mailto:CappersSG@aol.com">CappersSG@aol.com</a>	1. Do not tax alternative fuels!! If I drive 15,000 miles a year at 20 miles a gallon = 750 gallons/year x .09 (current?) equals \$67.50 – charge me a road use tax. Or if .18 equals \$135	1. SCAG simply recognizes that a heavy market penetration of alternative fuel vehicles would require reconsidering the current practice of providing tax incentives. As alternative fuel vehicles become more prevalent on the roads, costs for road repair should be proportional to use. SCAG recognizes that further study is required to assess market penetration and in turn, taxing alternatives. Consequently, SCAG is pursuing state budget augmentation for such a study.
195. Sharon O'Donnell Sunline Transit Agency 32-505 Harry Oliver Trail Thousand Oaks, CA 92276 760/343-3456 760/343-4147 Fax <a href="mailto:sbuturidas@aol.com">sbuturidas@aol.com</a>	1. Increasing ridership on existing routes. Funding for more buses. Solving congestion to make local transit work. Clean air.	1. SCAG recognizes the limitation of public funds in supporting transportation infrastructure needs, both transit and highways. SCAG will continue to further study options for raising additional transportation revenues for the region.  2, 3. Comments noted.
196. Leslie Grosjean		1. Increase incentives for using alternative fueled vehicles for private sector (individuals)

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
Sunline Transit Agency 32-505 Harry Oliver Trail Thousand Palms, CA 92276 760/343-3456 760/343-3845 Fax <a href="mailto:Lesliecn@ao.com">Lesliecn@ao.com</a>	Necessary funding in order to expand public transit systems.	SCAG recognizes the limitation of public funds in supporting transportation infrastructure needs, both transit and highways. In order meet the transportation needs of the region's growing population, SCAG will continue to further study options for raising additional transportation revenues.
197. Kerry Forsythe Sunline Transit Agency 32-505 Harry Oliver Trail Thousand Palms, CA 92276 760/343-3456 760/343-3845 Fax <a href="mailto:Kerryeng@aol.com">Kerryeng@aol.com</a>	1. Adequate funding to implement a really good public transit system that can provide a high level of service for consumers.	1. SCAG concurs with your comment that adequate funding is needed to support the region's public transportation system. SCAG will continue to further study options for raising additional transportation revenues.
198. The Bible Family 8718 Wiley Post Ave. 568-0963	1. No LAX expansion!	1. Comment noted.
199. Ken and Carol Carlson	1. The impacting of the 405 Freeway and the Westchester neighborhood by the expansion of LAX, the addition of ring roads, and an Arbor Vitae Interchange.	1, 2. Concern over traffic impacts from LAX expansion is noted. Airport expansion is a regional concern. Please see listing of aviation scenarios in RTP. SCAG has looked at numerous ways of decentralizing aviation facilities and demand throughout the region.  2. Airport expansion should be a regional concern with construction of better facilities at outlying properties (Ontario, Palmdale, El Toro, etc.). The Westchester community should not be impacted by additional roads.  3. We support the sub-committee recommendations not to include any new roads in the LAX - Westchester area.
200. Dennis J. Schneider	1.	1.

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
7929 Breen Avenue Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/338-1550 Fax	<p>Preface</p> <p>We recognize that this draft plan is a work in progress with a fixed April deadline to ensure continued Federal funding of projects. It is, however, very frustrating to review those sections addressing aviation travel and related ground transportation issues because major policy decisions are still being contemplated – even <i>after</i> the close of the draft comment period. It is like aiming at a moving target while wearing a blindfold.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p> <p>2. The challenges of future population and employment growth and their effect on traffic congestion, transportation investment choices, air quality and housing needs are significant long-range planning issues. In response, SCAG has created the Growth Visioning Subcommittee to inform, engage and facilitate consensus on a “Vision” - a strategy for addressing the challenging consequences of anticipated growth in the region. Specifically, this Subcommittee will provide a policy framework for growth forecasts; provide direction on producing alternative urban form scenarios; consider balanced and efficient growth and transportation patterns; and consider other sustainable development and environmental issues.</p> <p>3. Pervasive throughout the document is that decreased traffic flow and gridlock is inevitable – with all funded (and projected funded) mitigation projects. The “tone” of the document is that sufficient funding to improve present conditions is unattainable,</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE
	<p>and that we should be resigned to a future that includes reduced quality of life. Implicit is that funding limitations will not cover rudimentary maintenance of existing infrastructure in need of upgrades.</p> <p>An additional, separate section of project recommendations should be added to the Plan. This section should highlight “not yet funded” rapid transit and other pilot projects. These additional projects could be used to foster new, problem solving approaches. This additional section would provide a contrast between the “existing plans” that will, at best, maintain the status quo, and act as repository for forward thinking concepts to be refined. Although not be readily available for incorporation with in the next ten years, we must start NOW or we will never attain any improvements.</p>	<p>4. The 2001 RTP allocates about 60% of funding to transit, though it carries a far smaller share of travelers. To maintain the per capita transit ridership goal a mix of projects have been proposed that will provide good alternatives to the automobile in the near future. The services will have increased frequency, increased speeds, and better coordination.</p> <p>4. Continuing in a “business as usual” mode will not work. The underlying assumption throughout the Plan is that automobile transportation will continue as the primary, preferred mode of transportation, and that changing public attitudes toward increased use of mass transit is impractical. We will never improve (or even keep the present) quality of life without a major campaign to change in public attitudes. <b>Building a mass transit system is a must.</b></p> <p>Insufficient information is contained in the</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>documentation to assess the relative merits (and true public/private costs) of alternative transportation initiatives. Ridership mode percentages are assumed to be relatively inelastic in presented analyses, not habit modifiable. Cost per passenger mile relating auto versus bus versus light rail is not readily comparable.</p> <p>Two levels of information need to be incorporated into the documentation package. A “framework summary” should be used to accumulate the familiar coordinate d approach used to justify federal funding of projects. A second, more detailed level of compilation, specifying, detailed project lists under consideration with sufficient detail to enable us to define impacts on specific community areas/homes and businesses is also needed.</p>	<p>5. Severe Title VI, environmental justice, issues exist related to highway infrastructure projects and LAX expansion accommodations on the West Side of Los Angeles. It should be noted that no plan for major arterial increases in capacity on the West Side exist despite the addition of a minimum of a million more car trips into LAX and thousands of additional trucks added to the local freeway traffic. The current plan identifies a new exit from the 405 Freeway at Arbor Vitae. Construction of</p> <p>5. This project is part of the baseline and therefore not subject to review in the RTP process.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>this off-ramp will cause the removal of a large number of minorities and lower income people from their homes. This is yet another example of a title VI violation.</p> <p>6. <u>General Area of Concern – Aviation Facility Requirement Increase at LAX</u>  <b>Aviation passenger travel and cargo facilities must be disbursed throughout the region.</b> The assumption that people will <i>only</i> go to LAX is fallacious – especially as traffic gridlock increases throughout the West Side. Increased emphasis is required for expanding Ontario, Palmdale, San Bernardino, March AFB and El Toro (conversions to public use) to name a few of the airports. <b>Facility capacity expansion for both passenger and cargo must be regionalized, not focused at LAX where land is constrained in the population dense area of West Side Los Angeles.</b></p>	<p>Comments noted. Please see listing of aviation scenarios in RTP. SCAG has looked at numerous ways of decentralizing aviation facilities and demand throughout the region.</p> <p>The assumptions below apply to the development of a regional aviation capacity policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>§ Regional aviation facility requirements are increasing and needs must be addressed NOW. If regional needs are not met economic loss will occur.</li> <li>§ Facility expansion requires a multi-year action commitment before additional capacity becomes useable.</li> <li>§ LAX capacity is again approaching facility constraints. It would require</li> </ul>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>several years to increase capacity as presented in the LAWA December 2000 released draft Master Plan.</p> <p>S: Excess capacity at the regional airports exists to be utilized now, but they, too, need several years lead time before substantial additional capacity can become available to meet projected regional requirements.</p> <p>S: Insufficient resources exist to simultaneously expand LAX and other regional airport capacities. If construction resources are diverted to LAX, other airport capacities will not be available when LAX is again constrained resulting in economic loss to the region as a whole.</p> <p>S: Even if LAX undergoes another construction expansion it will undoubtedly become "maxed out" again in 10 years with little hope of ever meeting all of the region's capacity requirement.</p> <p>S: LAX has a small "land footprint" so the sky above it is also limited. The environment of highly populated areas will be distressed to the north, east, and south. Millions of people will be subjected to significant aircraft noise, fumes, and major aviation collision risk. Airborne chemicals and jet noise will compromise health and safety. Levels below the FAA's present noise "impacted" threshold have been demonstrated to be severe enough to cause problems.</p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>S' Each LAX expansion will add major amounts of air and ground traffic to the areas outside of the LAX boundaries. Even if more facilities are built to accommodate the on-airport traffic, the impact on surrounding freeways and major thoroughfares cannot be mitigated.</p> <p>S' Substantially higher costs are incurred to increase LAX capacity over increasing other airports (SCAG Technical Appendix G estimates a \$2.4 billion differential).</p> <p>S' Adding any activity to LAX impacts highly populated areas. Minority loaded areas will bear an undue amount of the impact.</p> <p>S' Proposed LAX expansion projects such as the "LAX Connector Road" as presently Projected will take a major piece of the 1937 National Historic Landmark, the Centinela Adobe, and impact California designated Landmark Randy's Donuts. It will also cause major impact on the primary rail line that runs along Aviation and Florence Boulevards. This project and the Arbor Vitae exit from the 405 Freeway should be rejected.</p> <p>S' LAX air corridor changes along the north side now encompasses Venice, Culver City, Ladera Heights and out to and including Monterey Park! As more aircraft are added to the skies around LAX more areas will be subjected to significant, but not necessarily</p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p><u>Some Specific Document Comments</u></p> <p>7. Exec Summary Page 4: The funding sources listed are optimistic for gas tax equivalency vehicles. If you want to encourage alternatives to gasoline you can't tax it as heavily.</p> <p>8. Exec Summary Page 9: Goods movements should have some projects identified to accommodate the thousands of additional trucks resulting from LAX growth – either from the latest Scenario 8 or more aggressive expansions.</p> <p>9. Exec Summary Pages 15-16: Policies 3,10,18, 19, 20 are good in concept. Even though Scenario 8, the one chosen in the TCC earlier this month, is partially in conflict with the objectives.</p> <p>10. Exec Summary Page 22: Regular reporting of Aviation Committee activities should be incorporated into the plan.</p> <p>11. Exec Summary Page 26: Public participation and outreach should be expanded to the earliest phases of draft development. All of the RTP appendices should be posted, not just the summary.</p> <p>12. Exec Summary Page 51: The estimated percentage of regional cargo volume</p>	<p>7. SCAG recognizes the difficulties associated with actually implementing taxes on alternative fuel vehicles. SCAG is simply advocating the need for further study and assessment of alternative fuel vehicles in the market and in turn, impacts on transportation revenues.</p> <p>8, 12, 16. Scenario 8 provides for significant dispersion of air passengers and cargo to other airports in the region relative to the baseline and most other scenarios. Moreover, Scenario 8 does not allow for expansion of capacity at LAX. In terms of specific access projects for LAX or any other airport in the region, it is the responsibility of the host local cities and authorities to develop plans for arterials and other streets, and provide for their inclusion in the RTP's list of projects.</p> <p>9. Comment noted.</p> <p>10. Comment noted.</p> <p>11. Comment noted. Some outreach meetings were held several months before release of the draft RTP. All the appendices are posted at SCAG's website, <a href="http://www.scag.ca.gov">www.scag.ca.gov</a>.</p> <p>12. See response 8 above.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>handled at LAX appears to be lower. More efforts need to address goods movements to facilitate redistribution to other airports.</p> <p>13.</p> <p>Exec Summary Page 59: The TCRP projects referred to are insufficient to even keep the congestion steady when compared to anticipated use of the 405. Additional action to reduce the gridlock must be addressed since these are identified as "capacity enhancement projects."</p> <p>14.</p> <p>Exec Summary Pages 62-64: PSR and feasibility studies are outstanding for all of these projects. A more comprehensive list of "concept" level projects should be identified along with the responsible agencies.</p> <p>15.</p> <p>Exec Summary Pages 68-69: Transit corridors, Table 5.12, should be expanded to include more light rail and mixed use rail.</p> <p>16.</p> <p>On the West Side of Los Angeles arterial improvements have not generally been identified even though virtually every North-South artery becomes bumper-to-bumper during commute times.</p> <p>Alternatives, such as light rail need to be identified. Using the rule of thumb that an additional freeway lane can handle about 500 autos per hour at 15 mph, it becomes clear that NO LAX expansion is justifiable since the only 405 Freeway "improvement" is extending the HOV land. Other related</p>	<p>The Governor's Plan will not provide the only funding for projects to reduce congestion on the I-405. Additional projects in the Plan and Baseline will help to relieve congestion on this freeway.</p> <p>13.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>14.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>15.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>16.</p> <p>See response to 8 above.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>“arterial improvement” that have been proposed in support of an expanded LAX should be identified to determine impacts and funding status. Many of the proposed projects do not correlate with the LAX EIR/EIS justifications for handling increased traffic.</p> <p>17.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration. The above issues and many others have been brought to my attention at meetings held in my capacity as Airport Affairs Chair of several Westchester-Playa del Rey organizations and as a member/subcommittee chair of the LAX Community Roundtable.</p>	<p>17.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>1, 2.</p> <p>Comments noted. Please see listing of aviation scenarios in RTP. SCAG has looked at numerous ways of decentralizing aviation facilities and demand throughout the region.</p>
201.  Michael James ONA 7825 Hindry Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 <a href="mailto:Mzjames0@earthlink.net">Mzjames0@earthlink.net</a>	<p>1. LAX Expansion most important concern.</p> <p>2.</p> <p>It makes no sense to continually expand LAX's capacity. It seems that more than half the people served and certainly much of the growth forecasted for the region are/will be located closer to other airports than to LAX. Creating a situation which forces people to travel to the already saturated Westside is a disservice to all. I am in favor of improving the LAX facility to handle its current needs. Politics aside, can anyone truly make a sensible environmental or logistical case for the ever-expanding master plan of LAX?</p>	<p>1, 2.</p> <p>Comments noted. Please see listing of aviation scenarios in RTP. SCAG has looked at numerous ways of decentralizing aviation facilities and demand throughout the region.</p>
202.  James McClune Osage Homeowners	<p>1. Too much traffic in LAX area. Too much</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
5529 W. 82 Street Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/670-0212 <a href="mailto:mcclunejim@hotmail.com">mcclunejim@hotmail.com</a>	<p>noise in LAX area.</p> <p>2. Why build new roads when we cannot maintain the ones we already have?</p> <p>3. I am concerned that the Plan does not adequately address the quality of life for those who wish to remain living in the Westchester/Playa del Rey area.</p>	<p>2. The RTP places a high priority on operations and maintenance of existing roads, and includes funding in the baseline for this need. The plan proposes additional O&amp;M funding for new roads.</p> <p>3.</p>
203. D. Teaz <a href="mailto:shrotscale@userss.hasstabarchive.com">shrotscale@userss.hasstabarchive.com</a>	<p>1. Too much traffic on Sepulveda Blvd. at the Howard Hughes intersection and south toward the airport.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p>
204. Harry Rose 7725 Hindry Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/568-9472 626/443-0611 Fax <a href="mailto:hirose@mindspring.com">hirose@mindspring.com</a>	<p>1. My principle concern is the growing congestion created by the continued expansion of LAX and the detrimental effect this has on our nearby communities. In the New York area, five international airports serve a population base the size of ours yet our transportation officials continue to tell us that LAX expansion is our best option. People who live as far away as San Diego must travel to LAX to fly to many locations. This is bad transportation planning that places an undue burden on our community.</p> <p>2. We need a regional solution to air traffic growth. The proposed LAX ring-road which would be constructed at the expense of the community of Westchester will only create other traffic problems elsewhere</p>	<p>1, 2, 3, 4. Please see listing of aviation scenarios in RTP. SCAG has looked at numerous ways of decentralizing aviation facilities and demand throughout the region. Concern over impacts of Maglev linkages to LAX on LAX is noted.</p> <p>The proposed Maglev system would connect to all existing and/or proposed major regional airport facilities in Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties.</p> <p>LAX growth is constrained by runway capacity. The Maglev will offer alternative air passenger connection to other regional airport facilities and could substantially relieve ground access congestion in and around LAX.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>nearby. The proposed Maglev route will only funnel more people to LAX increasing pressure for airport growth. We need an international airport in Orange County, Palmdale, and San Bernardino County and we need to encourage airlines and airfreight carriers to actually use them.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>I oppose the LAX ring-road and the Union Station to LAX Maglev link. The long-term effects of these proposals would only compound the problems of communities surrounding LAX.</p> <p>4.</p> <p>The proposed MagLev system would connect to all existing and/or proposed major regional airport facilities in Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside and San Bernardino Counties.</p>	<p>1, 2, 3.</p> <p>Please see listing of aviation scenarios in RTP. SCAG has looked at numerous ways of decentralizing aviation facilities and demand throughout the region.</p>
205.  Paula Kagy	<p>918 Virginia St. Los Angeles, CA 90245 310/823-0466 310/823-2404 Fax jrkgy@aol.com</p>	<p>1.</p> <p>I'm against the proposed LAX expansion. All proposed alternatives will decimate this community. We already have more noise and pollution than we can handle. There is no buffer zone between LAX and residential and there is no mitigating the problem. To propose to move a runway that is already less than a quarter mile from my home even closer would make the area uninhabitable for residential. Add to that, the extension of a freeway and Metrolink practically to my doorstep is unimaginable.</p> <p>2.</p>

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
	<p>I believe regional is the only way to address the problem. Orange County, Riverside, and Lancaster have to share the burden in providing their residents with air transportation. It would reduce commuter travel into Los Angeles and relieve some of the congestion on the freeways.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>We need a regional plan that encompasses the entire region. I believe that LAX has exceeded their capacity and that has negatively affected the surrounding area. The noise and pollution can not be mitigated and it is time for the other communities to step up to the plate and do their share to provide adequate transportation.</p>	<p>1. Comment noted.</p> <p>2. Comment noted.</p> <p>3. The implementation of the innovative Rapid Bus in conjunction with intelligent transportation systems technology has increased mobility on transit corridors. As a result of this success the Draft 2001 RTP proposes a 6% increase in these lines. The region is committed through the State Implementation Program to achieving a bus fleet with a minimum of 70% clean fuel buses by 2010. Since 1998 diesel buses have been required to undergo smog checks and in the future, under rule by the Air quality Management District, will more than likely become obsolete.</p>
206.  Benny Munoz ONA 7719 Midfield Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 <a href="mailto:Bohemien@aol.com">Bohemien@aol.com</a>	<p>1. I am against LAX expansion. It will destroy our neighborhood, the Westchester area.</p> <p>2. No more tunnels, bring back the red cars.</p> <p>3.</p> <p>I saw an ad on a MTA bus "500 more buses." More buses will not solve traffic congestion that we already have with the existing smog-producing buses. Are they ever tested like our automobiles for emission standards?</p>	

NAME, ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	COMMENTS	SCAG RESPONSE RTP
207. Christopher Edler 7814 Goddard Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 <a href="mailto:Go4baroque@earthlink.net">Go4baroque@earthlink.net</a>	1. Noise and continued traffic congestion. Deterioration of real estate equity.	
208. Elyse Guerrero 7562 Midfield Ave. Los Angeles, CA 90045 310/348-9221 310/453-6562 Fax <a href="mailto:elyse@fmma.com">elyse@fmma.com</a>	1. LAX expansion – ring road that will cut into the Centinela Adobe on Midfield Avenue.  2. Please don't build this road until further mitigation efforts have been made to the Osage area regarding LAX expansion.	
209. Jim Stewart Coalition for Sustainable Transportation 1247 Lincoln Blvd., #253 Santa Monica, CA 90401 310/281-8534 310/455-3011 Fax <a href="mailto:scceedmail@aol.com">scceedmail@aol.com</a>	1. See attached comments.  See responses to comments from Southern California Council on Environment and Development.	